THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

O. 12. MARCH, 1935. VOL. XXIV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

'HEN I SPAKE UNTO THEM OF PEACE . . . '

The Westminster Group, inspired by the desire to secure a ter understanding and closer co-operation between Anglo-holics, Evangelicals, and Modernists, has promoted an effort own as the Truce of God. A meeting of this newly-constituted ly, which included a number of very influential Anglo-Catho-, was called for February 11th. On February 8th, the *Church nes*, in the hope, so it is alleged, of torpedoing the move-nt, published a leading article entitled 'An Unequal Yoke,' cely attacking the Modernists on account of the publication distribution by the Modern Churchmen's Union of a book-entitled *The Modern Meaning of the Bible*,[1] We cite the cluding paragraph of the attack of the *Church Times*:

'If an organization which claims to be Anglican is permitted to disseminate, below cost price, teaching of a character so outrageously disloyal, it is intolerable that anyone should ask Catholics to observe a truce. They cannot yoke themselves unequally with adherents of another religion. A writer in last week's *Christian World* observed that the only mood in which it is worth while entering into conference for Christian unity is the "mood of being ready to sacrifice what we had thought of as principles." This certainly would be the only mood in which we could enter into any fellowship with the authors of the teaching which we have criticized. We could only be at peace with them if we were to murder all our convictions and commit suttee on their pyre.'

[1] To be obtained from the Churchmen's Union Office, price 1/-.

The Modern Meaning of the Bible consists of four brief chapters contributed by Mr. R. B. Henderson, Headmaster of Alleyn's School, Dulwich; the Rev. L. B. Cross, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford; the Rev. F. P. Boys-Smith, Rural Dean of Lyndhurst, with a Preface by Dr. Cyril Norwood, President of St. John's College, Oxford, and formerly Headmaster of Harrow, in which he heartily commends the booklet to those for whom it is intended.

The reputation of these writers should at least have prevented so gross an attack upon them. Dr. Norwood is one of our leading English educationists and is well-known for his deep loyalty, not only to the Christian religion, but to the Church of England. We believe that it was at the special request of the late Archbishop Davidson that Dr. Norwood resigned the Mastership of Marlborough to become Head of Harrow.

Mr. R. B. Henderson is almost equally well-known for his endeavours to base English education upon Christian principles, and was recently honoured, although a layman, by receiving the B.D. of Lambeth — the first layman to receive this distinction from an Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Rev. L. B. Cross is well-known in Oxford as one of the most influential of theological tutors. He is an examining chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester.

The Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith is a venerable and scholarly clergyman in the Winchester Diocese.

That the *Church Times* should accuse such fellow-Churchmen of being 'outrageously disloyal' and should roundly declare that they are 'adherents of another religion' is evidence of an intolerance which we had hoped the *Church Times* had foresworn.

A fortnight later the *Church Times*, rejoicing in the designation, not of Anglo-Catholic, but of Liberal Catholic, affirms in its leading article of February 22, entitled 'Liberal Catholicism,' that:

> 'We who cherish the name of Liberal Catholic have no desire to fetter the liberty of others to use those methods of Liberal inquiry which commend themselves to our own judgment . . . If it is the method which makes the Liberal, it is the conclusion which stamps the Catholic.'

Yet the late Archbishop Temple declared that where the conclusions are prescribed the research is precluded.

If we are to have, as indeed we must have, freedom of research, we must also concede the right to follow reason 'whithersoever the argument lead.'

It is this freedom which the contributors to *The Modern Meaning of the Bible* have claimed. Great difficulties and dangers must always attend simplification and generalization. Such writers can always be charged effectively with having said too little or with having said too much. If, of half-a-dozen solutions of some literary or critical problem, they expound one and do not mention the others, they can be accused of deceiving their simple readers, yet had they expounded the six solutions they could more truly be charged with having confused them. At least three, of the four contributors to this booklet, have the reputation of being, not only competent, but even brilliant teachers, and it would seem only right where their Christian character is unblemished and their educational capacity acknowledged that their efforts to perform the difficult task of presenting ancient truth in modern terms to young people should have been treated by their fellow-Churchmen with courtesy and charity.

The test in such a case must be the reception accorded to the venture in the educational world. *The Modern Meaning of the Bible* has had a most gratifying reception. Headmasters and headmistresses, experienced teachers in less exalted positions, have written warmly of the booklet. Its purpose is not to treat the whole Christian Faith as enshrined in the Church's dogmatic formularies but to introduce modern Bible study to the attention of members of the Sixth Form. It does not presuppose either Christian conviction or Church membership. Its function is not that of the parish priest but of the public school master. It seeks to arouse interest in Bible study by presenting in outline a modern view of the Bible. It takes its stand on the vantage ground of acknowledged historic truth and indicates very simply some of its implications.

The attack of the *Church Times* upon this Modernist booklet reminds us of the assault made by a certain mediaeval Pope upon a notable treatize which will be read long after the Pope is

forgotten. This book, said the Pope, though small in size, is great in its depravity.

The book was not depraved, but an infallible Pope was mistaken. We hope that 'ere long the *Church Times*, which does not claim infallibility, will regret, when it has thoroughly digested the implications and obligations of Liberal Catholicism, that it should, in the interests of a misguided ecclesiastical diplomacy, have striven to put asunder those whom God has made one.

There is no reason why the rapidly increasing bodies of Liberal Catholics, Liberal Evangelicals and Modernists should not dwell happily and helpfully together in our national Church, and it is the main purpose of the Truce of God to promote this end.

The *Church Times*, for reasons best known to itself, is resolved to defeat this endeavour; yet to defeat it means, not simply disaster but even ruin to the Church of England, which above every other Church in Christendom can claim to unite in really effective fashion the ideals of Liberalism and Catholicism.

The New Catholicity.

One way of re-building Zion, and it has great authority behind it, is to create and proclaim Utopias of the New Jerusalem. It was the way of Ezekiel; it was the way of the Second Isaiah and it was the way of the Seer of the Apocalypse.

The Joint Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen for the securing of Reunion, of which the Chairman is the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Convener the Archbishop of York, thwarted by the practical difficulties of the existing situation, have created a vision of the ideal, not as a substitute for, but as a factor in, assisting the achievement of practical proposals.

Fear that principles will be sacrificed and values lost as the result of Church reunion, is the most formidable barrier in the way of success. The only solution of the problem which can please all parties is, as Dr. Streeter pointed out, that of Alice in Wonderland, where at the conclusion of the famous race the Dodo addressing the competitors said, 'Everybody has won, and all must have prizes.'

It is very hard, without seeming to be insincere, to affirm a sentiment of this kind, yet unless the essential values for which each of the separated communions has contended and suffered be preserved permanently in the re-united Church, there will be loss rather than gain. One purpose of a vision of Unity is to indicate how this can be achieved. The vision is truly Catholic and stands in no need of inverted commas.

> The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all 'who profess and call themselves Christians,' within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ.

The visionaries assert distinctly:

> In this document we are not concerned with the reconciliation of principles as such, nor with the process of transition to a united Church, but with the co-operation in a united Church of the adherents of these various principles. Our task is to show that the principles which various types of Church Order specially emphasize may be so related to one another in practice as to bring together in full confidence and fellowship those who attribute special authority and value to these various types.

The *Times*, how much changed ecclesiastically from that other Hector who was the hero of the Trojan ranks, criticised *A Sketch of a United Church** on the ground that it sought unity of organization as a preliminary to unity of belief, whereas the right method was to secure unity of belief first and then proceed to unity of organization. Archbishop Temple, we are glad to observe, pointed out in the *Times* of February 7th that in practical operations unity of organization and unity of belief must march hand in hand.

> 'My chief difficulty in assenting to the views expressed in your article is that it sets up a logical dilemma which is untrue to the facts; indeed the dilemma in relation to practical affairs is nearly always fallacious.
>
> 'One path (we are told) lies through unity of belief towards ultimate union of organization; the other through an immediate union of organization towards an ultimate unity of belief.
>
> 'Your article favours the former; and if I had to choose, so should I. But in fact neither way is open if the other is barred. Union of organization, in its completeness, is only possible on the basis of a far greater unity of belief than exists as yet; progress in unity of belief cannot go much further until we have such union of organization as will facilitate a greater measure of common work and common worship.'

* S.P.C.K., price 4*d*.

In the Christian Religion it is only by the interaction of faith and work that progress is achieved. According to Christian principles it is along the path of practical endeavour that moral and spiritual illumination is secured. 'If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine.' It seems to us that it can only be by Christians coming together and worshipping together and working together in one body, that they will achieve a growing unity of moral and spiritual conviction. At present all the separated Churches have enough Christian belief in common to admit of their coming together in this way and for this purpose. If corporate unity can be secured unity of doctrine will follow as a sequel. Of course by unity of doctrine we do not mean verbal uniformity of doctrine. We mean that common conviction on all essential points which is needful to unite men in common endeavour.

When we study the lives of the great saints of Christendom of every denomination we see how much they have in common, and it is important, when Christian reunion is aimed at, that it should be realized that it is not on the lower levels of organization, institutional rites and intellectual definitions, but in the sphere of the noblest moral and spiritual endeavour that real and abiding union is secured.

Reunion therefore ought to begin, not with trying to get separated Christians to think alike on doctrinal points, but to get them to worship together and to co-operate together in social service.

As Canon Guy Rogers pertinently asks in the admirable little booklet *The Church of England and the Free Churches*:[2]

> 'Are we prepared to follow the road which leads towards the Mount of Vision? The disloyalty to Christ, the confusion and waste and petty provincialism of the denominational system under which we are living to-day cry out against the continuance of things as they are. We are witnessing the decay of those great movements which in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries vindicated essential elements of freedom of conscience and variety of worship in the interests of the whole Church. Their work is done and needs to be replaced by a new

[2] *The Church of England and the Free Churches. The Road to Reunion*, by Archdeacon J. W. Hunkin, D.D.; the Rt. Rev. Norman Tubbs, D.D.; Canon T. Guy Rogers, B.D. (the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement and the Modern Churchmen's Union, Church House, Westminster), price 3*d*.

integrating and co-ordinating movement placing at the disposal of all of us the best things that each Church has in its power to share. The age of independence is over, the age of interdependence has begun. A new Catholicity is on the horizon.

If this unity is to be secured it must begin by stressing the values which Christ stressed and making them the supreme standard of Christian loyalty. If that be done the lesser ecclesiastical loyalties will find their fitting place. Especially if each denomination begin negotiations by offering to sacrifice any or all of their lesser denominational loyalties for the good of the whole.

Reunion without tears, like reunion without fears, is a reunion not worth possessing. In the end all that each denomination has sacrificed it will receive back a hundredfold. There are prizes for all, but they are not distributed before the race, but after it.

Tennessees : American and English.

It has been the fashion in Church circles to assert that the Bishop of Birmingham's pulpit teaching, which has sought to domesticate in our popular religion and ethics the idea of evolution, is merely preaching to the converted or flogging a dead horse. Parish priests, however, who are really acquainted with the mental condition of their parishioners realize what need there is for 'gorilla sermons.'

The *Times* of February 21 relates another incident in the long campaign in Tennessee where it would appear that Modernism and Fundamentalism are very unequally matched :

> The House of Representatives of Tennessee yesterday defeated a motion introduced by its youngest member to repeal the State law which prohibits the teaching of any theory that man is descended from a lower order of animals. This is the famous law under which ten years ago Mr. John Thomas Scopes, a youthful instructor in biology at Dayton, was convicted and fined after a controversy which had brought to the aid of the prosecution Mr. Bryan, the former Secretary of State, and to the aid of the defence such well-known lawyers as Mr. Clarence Darrow and Mr. Dudley Field Malone, and had made 'Fundamentalism' a household word throughout the country.
>
> The opposition to the proposal in yesterday's debate was led by Dr. Ruffin, the oldest member of the House, who carried a huge Bible to the rostrum and read from it the first chapter of Genesis. The vote against repeal was sixty-seven to twenty.

There are, however, many Tennessees in England, but the warfare raged in them between the powers of light and darkness is not recorded in the *Times*. We cite an incident which occurred last month in an English parish.

The Bishop of an English diocese, as patron of a living, submitted to its Parochial Church Council the name of a clergyman with an excellent reputation as a parish priest. The clergyman, however, was known to be a believer in a sane and reverent modernism. He was in consequence unanimously objected to by the Parochial Church Council. The following document emanating from the Parochial Church Council is indicative of the reasons for his rejection :

> 'With respect to the traditions of the Parish, the Council would strongly emphasize
>
> '(1) That since its foundation there has been a most decided continuity of Conservative Evangelical teaching. Every vicar has taught :
>
> '(*a*) That the Bible is the Word of God, fully inspired, infallible and absolutely authoritative.
>
> '(*b*) That the death of the Lord Jesus Christ at Calvary was sacrificial and substitutionary, and that it was a perfect atonement for the sin of mankind, rendering to God all that He demands in expiation of His broken Law, and further, that anyone believing this immediately receives from God Eternal Life, *i.e.* the sinner is saved.
>
> '(*c*) That the Lord Jesus will bodily return to this earth in the same manner as He left it at the Ascension.
>
> 'This teaching has brought abiding peace and true joy to thousands of worshippers at St. ——— and to-day is the foundation of the spiritual happiness for the bulk of our people. The Council are unanimous in declaring that no change is desired in this vital and Scriptural teaching.'

This is the 'four-square gospel' of Fundamentalism.

No pastor of souls would seek to perturb the religious faith of these good people, but it has to be realized that they represent the generation which is passing from us. The Church ought to make provision also for the moral and spiritual life of the generation which is taking their place. A judicious clergyman may be trusted in such a difficult period of transition to minister to the needs of both generations. It is true that youth and crabbéd age cannot dwell together happily unless freedom be granted to youth and reverence be paid to age. There are, however, parishes of 'mixed congregations' where the problem has been solved, and solved it must be in many more, if the Church is to survive and thrive.

An Echo of Kikuyu.

On becoming Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, Dr. Streeter has resigned his canonry in Hereford Cathedral. He, with Canon Lilley and the late Dr. Rashdall, were appointed to Hereford canonries by the late Bishop Percival in the face of severe criticism.

The present Bishop of Hereford in his diocesan *Messenger* writes of those stormy days when John, Bishop of Zanzibar, excommunicated John, Bishop of Hereford, for heresy :

> 'We have still in this house the document which was then issued in which Dr. Weston withdrew from communion with Bishop Percival because of this appointment and the copy of the draft of Bishop Percival's reply. It will be remembered that it was part of my predecessor's policy to find in our cathedral a position for leaders of the liberal progressive broad school of theology to which he himself belonged. All this is ancient history now and the bishop certainly brought to his diocese scholars of great distinction, some of whom happily survive on the cathedral chapter, and from whom much has been learned.'

We doubt if any other Chapter in the Church of England during the period can point to any three of its members who had done as much for the education of the Church of England and indeed of other denominations as have Dean Rashdall, Dr. Streeter and Canon Lilley. It is not needful from their point of view that such Christian scholars should receive ecclesiastical promotion, but it is well for the Church that they should be given positions of ecclesiastical influence. Dr. Percival, the creator of Clifton College, and after Arnold and Temple, one of Rugby's great headmasters, was, as a Bishop, a tower of strength to the Modernist, or Liberal Cause, as it was called in his day. That the wisdom of his policy should be recognized by his episcopal successor, twenty years after, is not only gratifying to Percival's admirers but an indication of the increasing strength of the cause which he espoused.

Pro-Roman Propaganda.

We receive many reports of the many-sided, vigorous and successful Romanist propaganda in England to-day. Unfortunately, some of this propaganda is being most effectively carried on by extreme members of the Anglo-Catholic school whose main interest is to assimilate the Church of England to the

Church of Rome with the object of incorporating the former in the latter.

An example of this is furnished by the following circular which is being widely distributed to our clergy :

> SOCIETY FOR CATHOLIC RE-UNION.
>
> On all sides we hear of efforts to gather together Christ's scattered flock.
>
> Especially the official Leaders of the Church of England are energetic in this direction.
>
> The Members of this Society, however, believe that Unity is already given to the Church, and safeguarded in the See of Rome.
>
> And that the Will of God is that the Church of England shall now be reconciled to that Communion from which she was violently and unwillingly severed by State action in bye-gone days : and that this is the True Road to general Unification.
>
> We ask you to give us the opportunity of bringing our conviction before your Parishioners : either on Sunday or week-day, as may be convenient : and in Church or other place (which latter has the advantage of being more appropriate in men's minds for free discussion : a thing we desire).
>
> We are, Yours faithfully,
>
> S. M. HARRIS, *Vicar of Egmanton, Newark.*
> H. J. ARNOLD, *Vicar of Gate Burton, Gainsborough.*
> E. Y. DAWSON, *Vicar of Whatton-in-the-Vale, Nottm.*
> W. DOLMAN, *Rector of Cromwell, Newark.*
> A. J. LINSELL, *Rector of West Retford.*
> J. PLOWDEN-WARDLAW, *Vicar of S. Clement's, Cambridge.*
> G. P. CROOKENDEN, *Vicar of Markham Clinton, Newark*
>
> (To whom, if desired, or to any of the above, application for Speakers may be sent).

We admire the sincerity and courage of those who sign it.

An effective reply to their propaganda is, we are glad to observe, furnished by the *Church Times* of March 1st :

> The writers of a letter, signed by a group of priests, and recently widely circulated, state that 'unity is already given to the Church and safeguarded in the See of Rome,' and that 'the will of God is that the Church of England shall now be reconciled to that communion from which she was violently and unwillingly severed by State action in bygone days.' These statements are historically inaccurate, and are, in effect, a complete surrender of the Tractarian claims. The writers seem to agree that the Catholic Church is restricted to the Papal obedience; that the occupant of St. Peter's See is by divine right the one infallible exponent of Christian faith and morals, and that all lawful ministerial authority is derived from Rome.

The implication is that the submission of every Christian is due to that central authority, and that, outside the submission, no separate communion has any right to exist. On these assumptions, no communion which rejects the Roman claims can be treated as an integral portion of the Catholic Church. The very fact of its separate existence is the clearest proof that the Church of England does not admit the Roman claims. The only thing that can justify separation is the conviction that the Catholic Church is wider than the Roman. It is unfortunate that, in congregations where Catholic doctrine is taught and Catholic devotion prevails, few of the members clearly realize why they are Catholics, and not Roman Catholics, and the effort of the Church Union to stimulate simple, straightforward instruction is highly to be commended. The Church of England has, we believe, an unanswerable case. It has no need to apologize for itself. But the faithful laity should understand the claims and the grounds that justify them.

The Next Modern Churchmen's Conference.

The twenty-second annual Conference of Modern Churchmen will be held at Girton College, Cambridge, August 26—31, 1935. 'The Church of England: its Constitution, Character and Call,' is the theme selected for discussion.

The Church of England is the most misunderstood Church in Christendom, and that by her own members. Some wish to conform her to Rome, some to the Free Churches. 'To thine own self be true' ought to be her motto. What she needs most to-day is to realize what she really is and to strive to fulfil her destiny. Loyalty to her essential constitution will best enable her to serve Christendom as a whole and the English people in particular.

Her constitution is complex; her loyalties are many. She touches life at many points and in various ways. No doubt we may add that many have been her mitakes and failures. Nevertheless she has potentialities and a breadth, variety, and richness of life possessed by no other Church.

The following popular volumes will be found useful by intending members of the Conference who have no special knowledge of the subject:—

The Church of England, by Canon Watson. Dent (H.U.L.). *The Genius of the English Church*, by A. Fawkes (Macmillan). *Anglicanism*, by Bishop H. H. Henson. *The Church of England* (Essays), edited by Very Rev. Dean Matthews. *The National Church*, by Dr. Percy Dearmer. *Church and Realm*, by Dean R. H. Malden.

MODERNISM AND REUNION*

AN ANGLO-CATHOLIC VIEW

By the Rev. H. L. Goudge, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

IT is a strange word which stands first in the title of my paper. What does Modernism mean when we use the word in connexion with religion? If in doubt as to the meaning of a word, I consult the great Oxford Dictionary, and generally not in vain. As a rule, its courage is unimpeachable: it has even tackled the words 'Catholic' and 'Protestant.' But before the word 'Modernism' its courage seems to have failed; it tells us nothing of the theological meaning of the word.[1]

Now how can I rush in where the great Oxford Dictionary fears to tread? The truth is this. The word Modernism has to-day no definite meaning whatsoever; and to attack or defend Modernism without careful explanation of what we mean by the word is merely to waste the time of everybody concerned. No doubt the word had a meaning once. It was applied to a Movement in the Roman Church, in England chiefly associated with the name of Father Tyrrell. Those who are interested in it will find an account of it in Mr. Vidler's book, *The Modernist Movement in the Church of Rome: its Origin and Outcome*. But the word is now seldom used with any reference to that Movement. Some of Father Tyrrell's writings made a great appeal to many English Christians; but the Movement for which he stood made very little. The English mind is historical rather than philosophical; its strength lies in its respect for facts and its power of dealing with them; and the attempt of the Roman Modernists to separate Christianity from its historical foundations was quite off the lines of English thinking.

What meaning, then, do we now give to the word? None that is easily intelligible. In the English Church it is commonly applied to those whom we used to call Broad Churchmen, but without attempting to distinguish between them. The small

* The Society of Reunion, for which this paper was written, is in the main an undergraduate society whose members are mostly Roman Catholics or Anglo-Catholics.

[1] In the latest edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* there is one article on English Modernism.—Ed., *M.C.*

body of clergy who have borne that name have never been homogeneous, or constituted what we should call a party. At one time a so-called 'Modernist' was likely to be a 'Liberal Protestant' of the school of Ritschl and Harnack; that kind of Liberal Protestantism is still, I think, in favour with some of our Broad Churchmen. But those who are called Modernists to-day are not always of that school. Some of them are orthodox Christians who differ little from other orthodox Christians except in paying special attention to the problems which modern thought and knowledge present. Some of them are people who dislike theology and refuse to take its problems seriously; while the rest, though including men of great learning and power, are too individual for general statements to be made about them. Meanwhile, the word 'Modernist' is frequently used by the less intelligent and conscientious of us as a kind of 'bad word' to throw at any person or view that they think heterodox, or find disturbing, or for some reason don't quite like. The poor word does so much overtime that, on the principle of Lewis Carroll's Humpty-Dumpty, its pay on Saturday night ought to be colossal. Thus, if we find ourselves called either Modernists or Anti-Modernists, we should, like Pet Margery's bereaved fowl, remain 'more than usual calm.' Whether, when either is applied to my unimportant self, the word is meant as a compliment or the reverse, I can only judge by the context, if there is one, or the tone of voice, if I have the advantage of hearing it. In either case, I remain a disciple of the fowl.

I.

What then am I to do when I am asked to speak to you of Modernism? The best course, I think, will be to exercise Christian charity to this unhappy word, and give it the best meaning I can. Modernism then, as I shall use the word, is simply the effort to deal frankly and honestly with modern thought and knowledge; to accept what seems to be sound, to reject what seems to be mistaken, and above all so to present the Christian faith and moral standards to the world as not to come into conflict with ascertained truth.

I am myself a Churchman; and, having been born in 1866, I am necessarily a comparatively modern Churchman. Till Mr. Wells brings his Time Machine into effective operation, I see

no means of migrating into any other century than this. As I look back over the past, I may conceivably prefer some earlier century to my own, but I must live and think and work in the century to which I belong. I am not immediately concerned with the thought of the fourth century, or of the thirteenth, or of the sixteenth, or with the various outlooks imposed upon the men of those centuries by the knowledge then available: I am concerned with the thought and outlook of my own time. In many things I may not agree with them; but I must know what they are, and take account of them, if I am to serve God where He has placed me. I cannot plunge my head into the sand; I cannot say, 'Go to: let us pretend that we are living in some other century,' and think and act as we should have thought and acted then. If to refuse to do that is to be a Modernist, I certainly am one. But if to be a Modernist is to be contemptuous of the past, to reject its thought and outlook before I understand them, or the basis upon which they rested, to suppose that everywhere the traditional view is sure to be wrong, to swallow whole every new theory that is presented to me, then I am not in the least a Modernist, and have no sympathy with Modernism either in religion or anywhere else. In every case I must be concerned, not with whether a belief is ancient or modern, but with whether it is true, and form the best judgment that I can.

That does not mean that I depend wholly on myself. About many subjects — *e.g.* astronomy — I know nothing, and simply accept the judgment of the best authorities. But even so I must decide for myself what the best authorities are, and how far my confidence in their views should go. Private or, as I prefer to say, personal judgment is unavoidable in any case; the only question is about the point at which we exercise it. On matters which it is our plain duty to study, we should exercise our judgment directly, though with as much acquaintance as possible with what the best authorities say; in matters which we have no time or opportunity to study, we can do little more than exercise our judgment in the choice of authorities: and in all cases alike we may be mistaken. That God for our own highest interests intends us to make the fullest use of all the powers that He has given us, and will hold us responsible for doing so, I regard as being as certain as any truth of religion can be. It is trouble-

some to do this, I know, and we are all disposed to avoid trouble wherever we can; it is generally pleasanter to shuffle off our responsibility upon somebody else; and the psychologists have much to tell us of infantilism and the Peter Pans who refuse to grow up. But study, and thought, and personal judgment belong to our calling as men and women. Great and manifold as is the grace that God is ready to bestow upon us, not only for right action, but for right thought also, it is never the purpose of grace to pauperize us, or to save us trouble. As Tyrrell says, God puts more into us that He may get more out of us; and that is as true of the intellectual life as of any other. The reason why 'private,' or personal, judgment has acquired a bad name is that too often by private judgment we do not mean any judgment worthy of the name, but simply the exercise of a supposed right to think and say anything we please without having taken any trouble to inform ourselves about the matter in hand. That is, of course, as stupid and presumptuous in religion as it is in anything else.

II.

Let us apply this to the question before us. How will the true Modernist deal with new knowledge and thought when they conflict with the views generally held in the past?

First, he will remember what is meant when we speak of the traditional view. So far from its being necessarily the case that the traditional view is a view without rational foundation, the opposite is almost always the case. The traditional view is the view which has so strong a rational foundation that at some time in the past it established itself against all the opposition which it had to face, and has held its ground ever since. The traditional view, for example, of the Person of our Lord is that of the Council of Chalcedon as it came to be interpreted in the following centuries. It established itself against great opposition; and among Christians no other view has made any headway against it since then. Opposition to the formula of Chalcedon to-day, you will generally find, is not opposition to it as theology, but opposition to the metaphysic which it is supposed to involve. Of course, intellectually speaking, the question may be reopened; any question may be reopened, as far as that goes. If you like to reopen the question whether the sun goes round the earth, or

the earth round the sun, you can of course do so. But you must not be surprised if those whom you ask to listen to you recollect a previous engagement. The point is that the traditional view about anything which men have seriously considered is generally right, or much nearer to being right than the opposite view. That Great Britain is an island is the traditional view; that King Charles I had his head cut off is the traditional view; that Beethoven is superior to Haydn is the traditional view.

Secondly, he will remember that, true as this is, he must not refuse to listen to attacks upon traditional views. That is what is meant by 'obscurantism'—one of the worst enemies not only of truth, but of faith also. If we are afraid to face facts, our faith is a make-believe: we may believe in believing, but we do believe. The real believer is never afraid of truth. Do not misunderstand me. It is often justifiable to refuse to be bothered with attacks upon our faith, when on the one hand we know the basis of it to be strong, and on the other have neither the time nor the ability to go properly into the difficulties raised. Only, if we take that line, we must let the questions involved severely alone, and not speak evil of those who differ from us about them. But as a general rule—and always, if we are to be teachers of others—we must be perfectly frank and honest in dealing with attacks upon traditional views. Though they are generally right, they are far from always being so; and modern knowledge may be of the first importance.

But distinguish carefully between modern knowledge and modern thought. Modern knowledge is vastly superior to ancient. Here, as Bacon said, 'antiquitas juventas mundi,' not its mature age. Knowledge is ever growing, however little we as individuals possess it; and the more we know the better. With modern thought it is otherwise; it is only superior to ancient in so far as it is based upon modern knowledge, and that it is often far from being. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that we are more intelligent than our forefathers; indeed, our thought, as thought, is generally, I think, inferior not merely to that of the Greeks in their best days, but to the thought of the better medieval centuries. If, for example, St. Thomas Aquinas handles any theological question, he begins by setting down all the known objections to the view that he himself adopts; he then

gives his own view with the authority upon which it rests, and a short exposition of it; then he does his best to answer the objections. That is to behave as a reasonable being; modern controversialists, Roman, Anglican and Liberal Protestant, 'please copy.' Then perhaps we may get to somewhere better than Cloud-cuckoo-town. We may differ from St. Thomas for many reasons: sometimes because we possess modern knowledge that he could not have possessed; sometimes because his authority (*e.g.* the Pseudo-Dionysius) is no authority; sometimes because our chief objections to his view were not before him; but never because he is intellectually muddled, or talking through his hat. Would that we could say the same of our controversialists to-day! No, what generally matters is modern knowledge, and not modern thought; and the former we must be prepared to welcome. If we will not, not only do we bar for ourselves all progress in thought and action; but, since faith rests upon facts, we poison faith at its source. We may chatter about religious questions in little coteries of our own choice; but we have no right to our opinions, and are merely a nuisance.

Thirdly, the wise Modernist is at first cautious even in dealing with what claims to be modern knowledge; though he tries to lay hold of it, he waits to see whether it will establish itself or not. Sometimes what claims to be knowledge has to be itself corrected. Generally we must wait and see, 'test all things, and hold fast to that which is good.' If what is new is also true, what will happen is this. It will establish itself against all opposition; it will itself become the traditional view, and we shall almost forget that it was ever modern. Indeed, something very amusing occasionally happens. A new view becomes traditional before it has much right to this position, and collects an army of traditionalists who are shocked if it is challenged. Suppose you suggest in some academic circles to-day that the demoniacal possession of which we read in the Gospels was precisely what the Evangelists supposed it to be, or that the mystical interpretation of Scripture is in its own place and under proper safeguards exceedingly valuable, or that the Gospel of St. Mark is not on the whole as valuable as the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and want to argue these points on rational grounds. You may find that you are up against a new traditionalism, and that your

hearers look down their noses as if you had propounded some pestilent heresy not to be tolerated by pious ears. I do not mean that real scholars behave in this absurd way; real scholars are usually Modernists in the sense that we are giving to the word to-day. But we should be upon our guard. Human nature alters little, and that desire to save ourselves trouble which lies at the root of all traditionalism is not at all confined to those who are generally called traditionalists.

But, fourthly, the time comes in a vast number of cases when there is no serious doubt that what is new is also true; and then we must accept it and act upon it, whether we like it or not. As a rule, I think, we have come by that time to see that the new truth is fully consistent with our fundamental faith, and sometimes a help rather than a hindrance to it. But that is not why we accept it: we accept it because it is true. Of course, by saying that it is true I do not mean that no one but a lunatic could dispute it; in this twilight world we can seldom prove things of importance as completely as that. I mean that what is urged for it is so immeasurably greater than what is still urged against it that it is our duty as reasonable beings to accept it. Perhaps a few illustrations will make the matter clear.

Take first the greatest shock which Christian faith has ever had to bear — Copernican astronomy. There is nothing to wonder at in the condemnation of Galileo, and not so very much to blame; his views would no more have been tolerated by Anglicans or Continental Protestants than they were by the Roman Church. Protestants are justified in saying that the Roman Church held and authoritatively taught a doctrine of Biblical inspiration which has turned out to be false, but not in blaming it for acting on the doctrine that it held. Not only does Copernican astronomy appear at first sight to make men utterly unimportant and so throw doubt upon the whole Christian faith; but it is a contrary to Scripture, and to what Christians everywhere had believed and taught about Scripture, as the Roman Church declared it to be. To be extremely cautious in face of this new astronomy, to wait and see, was not obscurantism but common sense. Galileo was in fact right; but he might well have been wrong, and done serious harm before his views were proved to be mistaken. To-day, of course, the new astronomy is not only

everywhere accepted, but everywhere traditional—so traditional, indeed, that we find it disturbing to hear of even such alterations in it as Einstein's theory of relativity seems to demand.

Take another case—historical criticism as applied to the Bible. That, too, was at first most disturbing to Christians of all communions. We were right to be cautious, to wait and see. Not only had much of the earlier German criticism proved to be ill-founded; the criticism of the great Tübingen school had broken down altogether; but, when the German criticism of the Old Testament was first popularized by *Lux Mundi*, quite a good case could be made against it. But here again the battle has been won in the sense that practically all scholars apply critical principles to the Old Testament just as they do to all other ancient literature, and do not suppose that all which there looks like history is history in the modern sense of the term. I was much interested a year or two ago to hear in Campion Hall a paper by a Roman father in which he maintained that the sons of Jacob were really the signs of the Zodiac. This was strong meat even for me, but I saw no signs that the other Roman fathers were more startled than I was. We might not be convinced, but we were quite ready to listen to what might be said for that hypothesis. So it is in the New Testament also. The great Roman writers on the subject, such as Father Lebreton and Father Prat, know all about modern criticism and take account of it. It may be new and disturbing, but there it is. We cannot refuse to look at it; we must consider in a rational way what in it is true, and what is erroneous, without regard to predilections of our own which are less firmly based.

Once again, consider modern psychology. Here we are still in the cautious stage, and rightly so. Psychology is hardly a science yet; we have in it almost a case of '*tot homines, tot sententiae.*' There is, I understand, as yet no solid body of psychological truth which the psychologists can ask us to accept. But this state of things will probably pass away, and psychology become within its limits a science as firmly established as other sciences. When it does, we shall accept its teaching, and correct our former errors by it. Very useful, I expect, it will then be, not only to doctors of medicine, but to doctors of theology, and above all in the Confessional.

III.

And now let us consider some of the great Modernists of the past, and the example which they have left to us.

Our first example shall be 'one Paul,' of Tarsus in Cilicia. Paul was a Jew, a member of Israel, the Church of God as it was before our Lord came. Thus the basis of his religion was Scripture and tradition, Scripture as interpreted by the current tradition of the Church of his day. He was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, one of the greatest of Jewish teachers, and was probably himself intended for the profession of a scribe. Gamaliel, if we may credit St. Luke, was himself a bit of a Modernist, inclined in view of Christianity to wait and see. But Paul of Tarsus did not follow him there: his Jewish orthodoxy was far too robust for that. He regarded Christianity as an abominable heresy, and conscientiously set to work to stamp it out. And then on the way to Damascus something very disturbing happened. Jesus of Nazareth, whom in His members Paul was persecuting, came and spoke to him about it, asked him why he was doing what he did. Paul had thought that Jesus of Nazareth had died under the curse of God, and was done with for ever. But He was very much alive. He could blind Paul, and remove his blindness; He could leave him in spiritual darkness, or call him out of darkness into His own marvellous light. There was nothing further about which to wait and see; these things were facts for Paul, new facts of which he must take account; and, like the good Modernist he was, he did take account of them. It was no doubt very disturbing to find that the tradition he had trusted was in large measure a false tradition, and that his Bible, the Old Testament, did not mean what the tradition of the Church said that it meant. But Paul faced the new facts, and followed where they led; and so became the saint and doctor whom we know.

Did he then throw his old religion to the winds? Not so: he was far too wise a Modernist for that. Because there had been much that was mistaken in his traditional religion, it did not follow that there had been nothing that was true. St. Paul held fast to all that was true in the old religion; and even to some things, to which, as far as we know, our Lord had never set His seal. There are things in St. Paul's writings which come from

the Jewish theology of his day, and are neither denied nor affirmed in the teaching of the Lord. But St. Paul saw all with new eyes. The Old Testament rightly understood bore witness to the Lord; the saints and heroes of the past had foreshadowed Him; Israel had been the Catholic Church in the making, and the Catholic Church now had one continuous life with Israel, out of which it sprang. Christians alone were the true Jews, the true circumcision, the true seed of Abraham; and those who rejected the Divine Head whom God had sent to His Church were, while their rejection continued, dead branches cut off from the one true olive-tree. St. Paul had not been in any way unfaithful to the Church, or to its glorious past. But he had had to correct its traditional teaching by the new light that had been brought to him.

Take another great Modernist — St. Thomas Aquinas. You may think it paradoxical to call him a Modernist, but he was a Modernist in his own day. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the Christians of the West knew practically nothing of the best science and philosophy which the world possessed. The Roman Empire in the West had never really assimilated the science and philosophy of the Greeks; the Great Schism had separated the Christian West from the better knowledge and culture of the Christian East; and, while the Arabs and the Jews, even in the West, were not unacquainted with the best knowledge of their day, the Christians were ignoramuses. Our popular conceptions here are rather amusing. We think of the Crusaders as cultivated gentlemen leaving their homes to fight savage hordes of Saracens. But it was the other way about. If you want to know the facts, read those delightful books, *The Legacy of Islam*, and *The Legacy of Israel*, or Mr. Christopher Dawson's *Medieval Religion*. It was, he says, in his recent book, *Medieval Religion*, 'in Spain and Sicily, in the trading cities of the French and Italian Rivieras, and at the feudal courts of Provence and Catalonia that the Christians first came under the influence of the brilliant civilization that had developed in Western Islam from the tenth to the twelfth centuries . . . It was here that the Christians put themselves to school with the Arabs and the Jews, and laid the foundations of the new scientific culture of the West.'

Now that was Modernism, and it was of course opposed. Not only was it humiliating for Christians to have to go to school with the enemies of the faith, but it was a danger to faith itself. In the thirteenth century, as in the nineteenth, good science was closely associated with bad philosophy which Christians were bound to reject, and it was not easy to distinguish the one from the other. Thus Mr. Dawson tells us that from 1210 onwards a series of episcopal and papal pronouncements were 'directed against the study of the physics and metaphysics of Aristotle at the University of Paris which had now become the acknowledged centre of Western thought'; and that, as this Modernism spread, 'in 1277 Bishop Tempier, supported by John Peckham, the disciple of St. Bonaventure and the future Archbishop of Canterbury, issued a sweeping condemnation of modern errors which was aimed impartially at the three leading representatives of the new movement of thought: Siger of Brabant, Roger Bacon and Thomas Aquinas.' But it was in vain, as such opposition generally proves to be. The necessary work of reconciliation between religion and the best knowledge of the time begun by Albert the Great was continued and carried through by St. Thomas and in the long run received the approval of the Papacy itself. We think of St. Thomas to-day as the great pillar of traditional orthodoxy, but he was a Modernist in his own day.

Now pass to the sixteenth century. Here we are not, as far as Modernism goes, much concerned with the Protestant Reformation. The Protestants, I think, were generally as obscurantist as their opponents; and, except in Scotland, did little for education, while the Jesuits did a great deal. We are much more concerned with the scholars of the Renaissance, with their new scientific and philosophical outlook, with the detection of the forgeries upon which the Papal claims had so largely rested, and with the vast improvement in New Testament scholarship brought about by the new understanding of Greek. Of the new astronomy we have thought already. But the new knowledge was not confined to that; and it proved widely disturbing, as new knowledge often does. One amazing thing in the sixteenth century was this. The science of the Greeks, found so disturbing four centuries before, had now become itself traditional, and had an army of traditionalists to support it. It was not so much

the authority of the Holy Scriptures that needed defence as the authority of holy Aristotle. So with the New Testament. It was not the authority of the New Testament that was at stake, but the authority of the accepted text of the Latin Vulgate. If you want to know what the obscurantism of the sixteenth century was like, you should read Erasmus, who never identified himself with the Protestant Reformation. Very amusing he is about the charges of heresy which were the obscurantists' stock in trade. Here are some words drawn from the Preface to his New Testament, *Capita argumentorum contra morosos quosdam et indoctos*:

> 'Nomen haereseos quo gravius est et invisius Christianis auribus, hoc turpius est id temere cuique impingere. At isti nihil magis habent in promptu, nec dubitant haeresem inclamare, prius quam circumspiciant qua de re loquantur. Et quemadmodum uno sue grunniente grunniunt omnes, ita ad hujus aut illius clamorem omnes ejusdem factionis sodales vociferantur haeresim.'

That is all in the day's work; whenever new and disturbing truth is brought to us, we expect this pig-chorus to arise; just in so far as men have pinned their faith to some external authority, whether the Bible or the Church, they will always be most unwilling to have it challenged. Many members of the Church of England to-day will not accept the teaching of science or criticism, however clear it may be, if it conflicts with their doctrine of Scripture infallibility; and in the Church of Rome change is even more difficult. It was not till well into the nineteenth century that the works of Galileo and Copernicus were removed from the list of prohibited books; and it was only a few years back that it became first permissible to say publicly that I *Jn.* v, 7, is unauthentic, though Erasmus proved it to the hilt three hundred years ago. Well — better late than never.

IV.

I need not carry my illustrations further. But you will probably be saying, What has all this to do with Reunion? It has everything to do with it; for Modernism in the good sense of the term, the steadfast determination to seek truth and to accept truth, however unwelcome it may be, and however humiliating to our personal or corporate pride, is under God the only path to reunion that there is. To say that is in no way to forget the

work of the Spirit of God; for the Spirit of God works through reason and conscience, and it is never His work to provide us with facts. His work is to cast His light upon the facts, to enable us to see what they mean, and arrive at truth by them. If we are not prepared to bow to facts which we do not like, the Spirit of Truth must leave us to the falsehoods we have chosen, and the divisions that they bring. But if we love truth above all things, we are on the way to unity. For facts are the same for all, and reason and conscience the same for all; and, when we recognize the same facts, and are enabled rightly to interpret them, we shall, as St. Paul says, 'all speak the same thing,' and 'be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment.'

What other way is there — the acceptance of some external authority, compromise, or what? If we are to be rational beings, before we accept an external authority its right to acceptance must be proved: and here, whatever the authority we select, the argument for accepting it, when it rests upon something better than a pragmatic foundation, is unconvincing, and often turns out to be an argument in a circle. We base *e.g.* the authority of the Church on Scripture, and the authority of Scripture on the Church. Or shall we try compromise? That is our English way. Somehow we Englishmen seem to suppose that we can apply the same sort of compromises in matters of truth that we successfully apply in matters of action. Our English success in political and social life is largely due to our good humour, our reasonableness, our willingness to give and take. Our failures, where thinking is involved, are largely due to our not recognizing that thought must be rigorous, and that, as Abraham Lincoln said, 'Nothing is ever settled till it is settled right.'

Will you forgive a somewhat pointed illustration? This society of ours, when I have attended its meetings in the past, has generally seemed to me to take a much narrower view of reunion than is customary in the Church of England; it has been interested almost exclusively in reunion with Rome. With that I have little quarrel; I myself greatly desire it; but not at the cost of truth. Have I not heard more than once something like this: 'Rome will not alter; therefore we must alter. If we accept the Papal claims, we shall get plenty of concessions on other points'? Once upon a time two London boys were con-

versing. 'There was a snaike,' said boy No. 1, 'come out of our cabbidges last noight; it was a good twelve fut long, it was.' 'Well,' said boy No. 2, 'that ain't much for a snaike; my farver's twelve fut hoigh.' 'Garn,' said boy No. 1, 'yer farver ain't twelve feet hoigh.' 'Well,' said boy No. 2, 'you tike six fut off that snaike, and I'll see what I can do with my farver.' There was an appearance of equity about this suggestion which was thoroughly English. If what the Book of Job calls the 'comely proportion' of the Protestant Leviathan is to be lopped, surely the Holy Father of the Catholics must submit to a corresponding diminution. But there is no road that way for anyone who cares for truth. The length of the 'snaike' and the height of the 'farver' are independent questions, and each must be settled, not by negotiation, but by mensuration; the sooner we get down to facts the better.

If I were asked whether I saw any hope for the Reunion of Christendom, and, if so, where, I should say, 'Yes, I see a great deal of hope, and chiefly in a marked increase of honest investigation, and so of true history.' Time was when history so-called, as far as religion was concerned, was not much more than controversy in disguise. Even where there was not hard lying, there was so much *suggestio falsi*, and *suppressio veri*, that it was a prostitution of the word history to employ it. History seemed to be regarded as 'too true to be good' for the ears of the faithful, and what was substituted was too good to be true. But the Creightons and the Figgises, the Actons and the Duchesnes of to-day, do not write Anglican history, or Roman Catholic history, or Protestant history; they try, as Creighton said, to write true history; and that makes all the difference in the world. If I am not mistaken, I notice both a new readiness on the part of Roman Catholics to recognize and tell the truth about the Middle Ages — Mr. Dawson's book is an excellent example; and a new readiness among Anglicans to recognize and tell the truth about the English Reformation, and to grasp the fact that there was a Roman Reformation also in the sixteenth century which went very far. If that change is as real as it seems to me to be, and the men of honesty and learning will do what they can to restrain the more disreputable gladiators on their respective sides, there is great hope for the future. Pope

Joan may take up her residence at the 'Nag's Head'—a most suitable hostelry. We may cease to dispute what is not disreputable; we may cut out the bluster and the bluff; we may confess the abysses of folly and cruelty into which we all have fallen. We may recognize that, whether Peter has 'two swords' or only one—and the civil weapon looks a bit rusty to-day—the proper place for the Christian's sword is always in its sheath. We may begin to learn from one another, and seek, not victory, and still less 'scores,' but truth. Then slowly but surely the area of our differences will grow narrower; friendly discussion will take the place of embittered controversy; we shall come to see that 'the Lord's servant must not strive, but be gentle towards all, apt to teach, forbearing, in meekness correcting them that oppose themselves.' There will not, I think, be any landslides of opinion; the questions which divide us are too various and complicated for that. But somehow we shall find that we have reached new ground, deserted many of our ancient controversies, and left the dead to bury their dead on half-forgotten battlefields. God hasten that time!

THE WESLEYS AND THEIR MUSICAL COLLABORATOR

By Clement Antrobus Harris, A.R.C.O.;
Author of *The Story of British Music*, etc.

THE genius for church music which we now associate with the name of Wesley did not appear till the generation following that of John and Charles Wesley, the Founder and Poet of Methodism respectively: the musical members of the family, Charles, Samuel ('Old Sam'), and Samuel Sebastian Wesley, being the sons and grandson of the Poet. It is well known that the great Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century owed almost as much to its hymn-singing as to its preachers. (It is perhaps less well known that it did this in common with all great religious movements in the Jewish and Christian Churches, when the vernacular has been the language of worship, from the days when the Babylonians demanded of their captives that they should 'sing us one of the songs of

Zion' up to the 'Hallelujah Lassies' of the Salvation Army.) The first Methodist tune-book appeared exactly two hundred years after that metrical-psalter with music published by the Calvinistic Fathers at Geneva, the phenomenal success of which earned for it the title of 'The Psalm-book of the Reformation,' the respective dates being 1742 and 1542. But even the Songs of Zion are of little use as propaganda without good tunes. Knowing this, John and Charles Wesley had to call in outside help — and, probably to their own surprise, it came from as far outside as the theatre! For one of their chiefest assistants and strongest personal friends — especially of Charles Wesley — was John Frederick Lampe, who began his professional life, and after his association with Methodism continued it, as a player, composer, and conductor of music for the stage. This meeting of extremes may perhaps in part have been brought about by a temperamental affinity, for, in an oft-quoted passage, Horace Walpole pronounced John Wesley 'as evidently an actor as Garrick,' and on Charles Wesley's entering Westminster School in 1716 it was said that he 'showed dramatic ability.'

Lampe was born in 1703 (as was John Wesley) somewhere in Saxony; in 1725 he came to London as bassoonist at Covent Garden Theatre, and soon acquired a high reputation as a player on that 'Clown of the Orchestra.' It is said that Henry Sarey, of *Sally in our Alley* fame, was a pupil of his. The two collaborated in several works, the most notable being an opera, *The Dragon of Wantley*, which met with an extraordinary success. In 1745 he composed *Pyramus and Thisbe*, a mock opera, the words of which were taken from Shakespeare, and also a composition to celebrate the suppression of the Stuart rebellion, which was performed in the following year at the Chapel Royal, Savoy. He was the author also of two works on musical theory and innumerable single (*i.e.* solo) songs — which, it is to be remembered, apart from folk-songs which are intended for collective singing, were quite a novelty at the time. It was while engaged on these two of his greater works that he came under the influence of the Methodist revival through reading John Wesley's tract, the *Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, and an hour's interview which he had with its author in 1745 was probably at his own request. It would have been extremely interesting to have had something more detailed than a bare state-

ment of this meeting between the General Booth and Arthur Sullivan of the eighteenth century, but it is not forthcoming, and we can form our judgment only from its results. These seem to have been of the nature of a compromise. Lampe in 1746 composed twenty-four tunes for Charles Wesley's *Hymns on the Great Festivals and other Occasions*. These were in use for many years by 'the People called Methodists,' and it was probably to reconcile them to the use of music written by a composer so closely identified with the theatre that Wesley wrote *The Musician's Hymn*, in which he paints Lampe's life previous to his conversion in lurid colours. It is one of the *Hymns for those that Seek and those that Have Redemption.*[1]

> With Tubal's wretched sons no more
> I prostitute my sacred power
> To please the fiends beneath;
> Or modulate the wanton lay,
> Or smooth with music's hand the way
> To everlasting death.

Could Lampe ever have spoken of his professional work in the words which Charles Wesley puts into his mouth? I think not. Richard Green in his *John Wesley, Evangelist*, tells us that Lampe had been 'a professed infidel.' This had probably come out at his interview with John Wesley. And it must have been this fact, surely, and not any 'prostitution of his sacred power to please the fiends beneath,' which caused the tears he is said to have shed when shown the ten verses on himself of which the above is the third. *The Dragon of Wantley* is nothing worse than a well-merited skit on the Italian opera of the day, and despite this fact is said to have been a great favourite of Handel's. Moreover Carey, who wrote the *libretto* of this and several other works of Lampe's, 'manifested an inviolable regard for decency and good manners.' Now obviously, if the new convert had thought that through his connection with the theatre he had made 'smooth with music's hand the way to everlasting death,' he would have washed his hands of it altogether: but he does not seem to have abandoned his operatic work even temporarily. In 1748 he went to Dublin, 'where he conducted theatrical performances,' and in 1750 to Edinburgh, where he did similar work at the Canongate Theatre. Here he died the following year.

Charles Wesley had formed a strong personal affection for

[1] *Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley*, Vol. IV, page 243.

his operatic friend, often spoke of him, and felt his death so keenly that the composer of *The Dragon of Wantley* and its successor, popularly known as *The Dragoness of Wantley*, became the subject of a second hymn by Wesley, *On the Death of Mr. Lampe*. In a single italicized word in this we may see the real attitude of the leaders of Methodism towards their convert: they would have had him act on the words put into his mouth in *The Musician's Hymn* (verse 4):

> Teach me the new, the gospel song
> And let my heart, my hand, my tongue
> Move only to Thy praise;

and give up his theatrical work altogether; but they recognized practical difficulties in this during his lifetime and rejoiced all the more that now:

> He hymns the glorious Lamb *alone*;
> No more constrained to make his moan
> In this sad wilderness,
> To toil for sublunary pay,
> And cast his sacred strains away,
> And stoop the world to please.

But the Methodists were not the only division of what may be called the Puritan State in Christendom to honour the memory of Lampe as both man and musician: the Presbyterians of Edinburgh did so equally, if we may trust the epitaph on his tomb in Canongate churchyard, for this expresses the opinion that his 'harmonius compositions'

> 'shall outlive all monumental register, and with melodious notes through future ages perpetuate his fame till time shall sink into eternity.'
> 'His taste for moral harmony appears throughout all his conduct. He was a most loving husband, affectionate father, trusty companion . . .'

The illegibility of the remainder of the inscription proves that its writer was not far wrong in saying that Lampe's works would outlast 'all monumental register.' But that they will still be in evidence when time sinks into eternity is less likely: for though hymn-tunes and chants often preserve a composer's name for centuries after his symphonies, oratorios and operas — even such a one as *The Dragon of Wantley* — are forgotten, only one of the many tunes (at least twenty-four) which Lampe composed expressly for the early Methodist hymn-books is to be found in the edition of 1904! This tune, known as *Devonshire* and also as *Solitude*, is included in the *Oxford Hymn-book*, and, to-

gether with another, *The Weeping Lazarus*, in the latest edition of *Hymns A. and M.*; but the long-measure tune *Kent*, once regarded as its composer's best, is not in any of the several books I have consulted.

In a well-balanced view of the attitude of the Christian Church as a whole towards the theatre, it is well to bear in mind that during the Cromwellian regime in England there was for some time a daily performance of opera, 'at the cockpit in Drury Lane at three after noone punctually'; the subjects were historical, and it has been whispered that one, *The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru*, given in 1658, was secretly encouraged by the Protector for political purposes. And with this, and Lampe's burial and epitaph in the graveyard of a Calvinistic church, we may well contrast the fact that at the interment of Beethoven, as late as 1827, under the rites of the Church whose services are the most dramatic in Christendom, the funeral oration had to be delivered outside the Wharinger cemetery in Vienna, because Anschutz, who declaimed it, was an actor, and as such not permitted to speak on consecrated ground.[2]

Perhaps it is not more than a pardonable egoism to add that the present writer's grandfather, Henry Taft, as a lad, was taken by John Wesley in a chaise from my great-grandfather's farm at Sandiacre, in Nottinghamshire, where Wesley had been visiting, to school in Leeds. In after years he used to relate how he had thought the Founder of Methodism an exceedingly dull companion, 'always either asleep or reading some learned book.' On leaving school he became a member of the Royal Society of Surgeons, and in 1790 served as a doctor in the war between Russia and Sweden. During this period he attended several foreign operatic performances (including one or two on Sundays: 'in Rome do as Rome does,' he says), and in an extremely interesting Journal compares them (unfavourably, especially as regards scenery) with our own. On returning, he graduated as an M.D. at St. Andrew's University, and later on became a 'Preacher of the Gospel,' to give the style and title by which Methodist ministers described themselves in those days.

[2] The *Canons of Hippolytus* in the third century prohibited the admission of actors into the Christian Church unless they first abandoned their profession.—Ed., *M.C.*

THE CENTENARY OF THE 'LEBEN JESU'

ONE hundred years ago Osiander of Tübingen — a book-selling and publishing business which dates back to the time of the Reformation, and which was still flourishing when I was in Tübingen in 1927 — published the first volume of *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet* (*The Life of Jesus critically examined*). The Preface was dated May 24, 1835, and the second volume October of the same year. The work immediately created an uproar, the repercussions of which had a lasting effect on the life of the author, David Friedrich Strauss.

Strauss was born on January 27, 1808, at Ludwigsburg in Würtemberg. The Swabians have at all time produced a grand succession of scholars, artists and thinkers. His parents were of the class of the higher bourgeoisie, such as frequently existed at that period in a small South German town lying somewhat remote from intercourse with the world. Ludwigsburg, once the capital of a gay but dissolute Court, had begun expanding but sank into ruin on the withdrawal of the grand ducal presence. A strange dreamy melancholy pervaded the place, half-finished roofless mansions, broad streets bereft of all traffic. All this must have had its influence upon the dreamy, introspective lad, who clung to his native city with faithful attachment throughout his life.

His grandfather had been tormented by the reflection that the majority of mankind were doomed to hell, and his father appears to have been a man of similar cast of thought. A retail merchant by calling, he possessed, however, a predominantly contemplative nature, and the somewhat indifferent success of his business was due to his devotion to pursuits of a more intellectual nature. His wife was a woman of sound common-sense, more interested in the practical than the dogmatic side of Christianity. When in later years there was theological dissension between father and son, her sympathies were with the son, not her husband.

David was the third child, two older children having died before his birth. He was somewhat weak in physique, had a fair,

pale complexion, delicate rather sharply-cut features, and clear blue eyes dominating the whole face with their depth and force of character. He was very methodical, and perhaps somewhat pedantic in his ways. Impelled by insatiable thirst for truth, he regarded it as the vocation of his life to destroy prejudice and shibboleths; as he said himself, he required to be angry in order to write. But above all he valued mental culture even more than knowledge.

In 1821 he was placed in the lower Evangelical Seminary at Blaubeuren, where he had as tutors Professors Kern and F. C. Baur — both of whom he also had as teachers a few years later at Tübingen. There Baur founded the famous Tübingen School of Theology: there he lived and died, and there his granddaughters are living to-day. After four years of arduous work on classical literature and ancient history, Strauss entered the theological seminary of Tübingen for a further five years.

It was the heydey of duels, *Burschenschaften* and turbulent political demonstrations, but Strauss kept himself aloof. He was, moreover, at this time much influenced by Schelling, and the Romanticists, Tieck, Novalis and Jacob Böhme. He even went so far as to take an interest in mediumship and clairvoyance, visiting the seer of Prevorst, a celebrated female medium. At the same time he had a growing dislike for the Rationalists, whose critical methods and results he regarded as the incarnation of unimaginative commonplace. Finally, through the influence of Schliermacher, and above all Hegel, he emerged from the dreamland of the Romanticists. From Schliermacher he learned to understand religion in its peculiarity, and from Hegel in its comprehensiveness.

He passed his examination with flying colours in 1830, and had a short experience of parochial work as deputy (*vikar*) to a country clergyman not four miles from his parental home. In 1831 he went to Maulbronn to give instruction in Latin, History and Hebrew to young men about to go up to the University. Among these was Eduard Zeller, afterwards Baur's son-in-law, and a well-known historian of Greek Philosophy. In the same year he went to Berlin to see Hegel, but Hegel's sudden death from cholera prevented their meeting. Strauss heard of this tragic event from Schliermacher, when he was paying his first

visit, and somewhat tactlessly remarked to his host, 'It was for his sake that I came here.' He was a regular attendant at Schliermacher's lectures, but the two men never formed any close friendship. It was during this visit that he drew up the plan of the *Leben Jesu.*

When he wrote his book two schools of thought held the field exclusively — the Supernaturalists, who believed in the actual occurrence of the miracles, and the Rationalists, who acknowledged the miracles but had a natural explanation for them. Strauss applied the method which Niebuhr had used with so much success on the early history of Rome. How can we explain the Gospel narratives? Strauss's answer is that they were formed neither by chance nor by conscious calculation or fabrication, but from an unconscious guidance by certain ideas and interests disseminated in the earlier Christian communities. There was, he thinks, a double interest at work in the formation of the legends concerning Christ; on the one side He was to be glorified as much as possible, and on the other the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy was to be proved in Him. The non-historical portion of the Gospels is, obviously, very great; in fact, everything is set aside that would oblige us to see more than a man in the Founder of Christianity, or to raise Him above the condition of His age and surroundings.

The most violent storm broke out immediately upon the publication of the book. On his return from Berlin he had been appointed under-master (*repetent*), and his philosophical lectures had become very popular. He was removed from this post, and became a teacher at the Lyceum of Ludwigsburg. Living at home, however, led to strong differences with his father, and in 1836 he resigned, going to Stuttgart, with the idea of devoting himself to literature. Here he brought out the 2nd, 3rd and 4th editions. In the 3rd edition he made considerable concessions to his opponents as regards the Fourth Gospel, but withdrew them in the 4th, which was published in 1840.

It was this edition which was translated into English by George Eliot and published (her first printed book) anonymously in 1846. Through the Brays of Coventry she got to know the Hennells and Miss Brabant, who was engaged to be married to Charles Hennell, author of *An Enquiry concerning the Origin*

of Christianity. Strauss much admired this book and procured its translation into German.

Miss Brabant, the daughter of Dr. Brabant of Devizes — a personal friend of Strauss — had, at the instigation of Joseph Parkes of Birmingham, a prominent liberal and advanced thinker, undertaken the translation of the *Leben Jesu*. On her engagement she wished to relinquish the task, and induced her friend to complete the work. She kept on till she had accomplished it, but in her correspondence with Sara Hennell she several times admitted to being often depressed, and before the completion was thoroughly bored. (For one thing, she had to teach herself Hebrew.) She went to church to please her father, worked away at her translating — six pages a day — not feeling quite sure, or sure at all, that she was doing the right thing.

She appears to have appreciated and adopted his general position, though now and then she had qualms. Miss Bray writes (February, 1846) that Miss Evans says 'she is Strauss-sick — it makes her ill dissecting the beautiful story of the crucifixion; only the sight of the Christ image and picture make her endure it.' This was a cast of Thorwaldsen's figure of the risen Christ in her study at Foleshill. The work was brought out by Chapman, a publisher of liberal views and proprietor of *The Westminster Review*, in 1846. Miss Evans received the very moderate fee of £20 for her work, but Strauss sent a good letter and wrote a Latin preface.

While abroad with Lewes in 1854 she met Strauss at Cologne, and again in 1858 at Munich, where she 'had a quarter of an hour's chat with him alone, and was agreeably impressed by him. He looked much more serene, and his face had a far sweeter expression than when I saw him at Cologne. He speaks with very choice words, like a man strictly truthful in his use of language.'

In 1839 Strauss accepted the offer of the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History and Dogmatics made by the Liberal Government of Zurich. There was immediately fierce and protracted opposition from the Conservatives, and the Government was forced to bow its head to the storm. The appointment was rescinded, and the Professor, who had not even entered on his duties, indemnified with an annual pension of 1,000 francs. All

this was not accomplished without disorder and even bloodshed. Amid yells and execrations Strauss was burnt in effigy and the ashes cast into the calm waters of the lake. One member of the Government was killed. The matter finally ended in the fall of the Liberals and the arbitrary election of a provisional government of the most reactionary type.

The same year saw the death of his mother: that of his father followed two years later. The following year, 1842, he married the beautiful and accomplished Agnese Schebest, an opera singer whom he had met several years previously. The union did not, however, prove a happy one, and, after five years, they separated by mutual consent. There were two children, a boy and a girl. After a time these made their home with Strauss, their love and mental development being a source of joy and solace to him.

The revolutionary troubles of 1848 did not leave him untouched. He was asked to represent Ludwigsburg in the Frankfort Parliament, but his election was prevented by the pietists. He was later on elected to the Würtemberg Diet, but he had not the gifts essential for political success. His moderation, his fearlessness, his aversion to all that was indistinct, wordy and tumultuous led to serious differences with his constituents. Not for him to suffer gladly the dominion of the phraseology, the vague instincts and the indiscreet passions of the masses. He therefore resigned his seat.

From now onward he travelled a good deal, visiting Munich, Weimar, Cologne and Heidelberg. In 1862 he published a biography of the theologian Reimarus and some other writers. Though interesting, these works are lacking in imaginative vividness in the reproduction of past events. *The New Life of Jesus* — a somewhat shorter edition — appeared in 1864. This edition is prefaced by a dedication of great dignity, 'Inscribed to the memory of my dear Brother, William Strauss' — a retired manufacturer of Cologne, who died of prolonged heart trouble before the book could be published. Strauss alludes to what he has suffered because of his views, and gratefully acknowledges how much his brother's sympathy and similarity of outlook has meant to him. The concluding paragraph is singularly pathetic:

> 'May a serene life's-evening be allotted to you after so many severe trials; may this volume satisfy your indulgence, and the dedication not

displease you; may it certify to our children and children's children the close spiritual intimacy of their fathers, and the faith in which, without any pretension either to sanctity or saintly beatitude, they at least lived honourably and tranquilly died!'

In 1865 he took up his abode at Darmstadt. There he formed a sincere friendship with Princess Alice of England, the consort of Prince Louis of Hesse. He read to her the lectures on Voltaire in manuscript, and, at her express desire, dedicated the published work to her. During the Franco-German War he wrote in a German newspaper what would now be called an 'Open Letter' to Ernest Renan, containing a somewhat ungenerous attack on the French nation.

The Old Faith and the New appeared in 1872. The work is disappointing. Strauss was too much dominated by Darwinism when he wrote this book. His powers of thought, never strong on the creative side, were through increasing age unequal to the task. It is, nevertheless, his philosophical and theological testament. Belief in the personality of God, or of our own personal existence after death, is abandoned. Towards the conclusion two questions are asked: (1) Are we still Christians? (2) Have we still any religion? The answer to the first is in the negative. To the second it is in the affirmative, if the assumption is granted that the feeling of dependence, self-surrender of inner freedom, which has sprung from the pantheistic world-view, can be called religion.

Strauss's eyes were now troubling him; portions of the *Old Faith and the New* had been written in a sick-room, and he was suffering from a painful disease. His complaint soon proved to be mortal, though it was not till after his death that it was discovered to be a cancer. He was fortunate in having the loving and skilful care of his son, who had become a physician. His mind remained active to the last, and he was even reading the *Phaedo* of Plato in the original a few days before his death. On the 29th December he wrote the following beautiful verses:

He to whom my plaint is
Knows I shed no tear;
She to whom I say this
Feels I have no fear.

Time has come for fading;
Like a glimmering ray,
Or a sense-evading
Strain that floats away.

May, though fainter, dimmer,
Only clear and pure,
To the last the glimmer
And the strain endure.

The persons alluded to in the first verse are his son and a very old friend to whom the verses are addressed.

His death took place at his native town on the morning of February 8, 1874, His son had been sent for by telegram, and in his arms Strauss breathed his last. He was buried on a stormy day, and in accordance with his own wishes, simply and without pomp in a pine-wood coffin. There was no religious ceremony, but on the day of the funeral a sum of money was given to the local authorities for the poor.

A century has passed. How fare Strauss and his work to-day? If as a rough sort of test we consult the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, we find that the last edition of an English translation was issued in 1898. Since his death there have appeared some half-dozen works concerned with various aspects of his life and works. The last of these (Tübingen, 1912) is a short University thesis dealing with some correspondence between himself and a friend, L. Georgii.

It must be said his mind was almost exclusively analytical and critical and entirely without depth of religious feeling or historical sympathy, and rarely constructive. Ferdinand Baur himself complained that his critique of the Gospel history had not been preceded by the essential preliminary critique of the Gospels themselves. Yet Albert Schweitzer in *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1910) considers that 'as a literary work the *Life* is one of the most perfect things in the whole range of learned literature,' and devotes far more space to Strauss than to any other author. In a beautiful passage he says:

> 'In order to understand Strauss one must love him. He was not the greatest, and not the deepest, of theologians, but he was the most absolutely sincere. His insight and his errors were alike the insight and errors of a prophet. And he had a prophet's fate. Disappointment and suffering gave his life its consecration. It unrolls itself before us like a tragedy, in which, in the end, the gloom is lightened by the mild radiance which shines forth from the nobility of the sufferer.'

The conclusions of the Tübingen School have had to be corrected on many points of detail; in many cases its theories have had to be abandoned in the light of fuller knowledge and

research. But it made enormous advances on what then appeared to be the bold innovations of such pioneers as Reimarus, Evanson, Tindal and Priestley. It is the imperishable glory of this school to have freed for all time the study of early Christian literature and history from the trammels of ecclesiasticism and obscurantism.

A. M. Coleman.

OUR DUTY TO BE INTELLIGENT

By the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D., Stanton Lecturer, Cambridge, 1931-4.

Mr. H. L. Mencken in his provocative *Treatise on Right and Wrong* informs us that the modern age has added a new ethical injunction, to be as intelligent as we possibly can. 'A new commandment give I unto you, that ye be intelligent.' Mr. Mencken is probably unfair in his account of Christian ethics, but it will do us no good to ignore his criticisms. Some years back in another work upon the history of ethics, Mr. Stephen Ward referred to 'the disparagement of reason' which accompanied the entry of the Christian faith into the Mediterranean world. Finally, in their volume of extracts from eighteenth century writers, Professor Creed and Mr. Boys Smith remind us that the eighteenth century marked the rise of a new type of civilization 'in which the autonomous reason claimed the supreme power and dispossessed the older conceptions of Divine Right,' and that the century itself was 'characterized by a strong belief in the capacity of human faculties to understand and master the world.'

These four brief quotations will serve well as texts with which to begin some observations about the prospects of human thought in 1935.

If there is a fact which stands out with more conspicuous clearness than anything else at the moment it is the almost universal reaction against intelligence. Mr. Mencken may be right as to the new commandment, but if so he must recognize that it is certainly at present being more honoured in the breach than in the observance. We may well seek for the causes of this reaction. Largely they are to be found in that principle of rhythm which characterizes all organic life, and which is given a form

of recognition in dialectic schemes wherein thesis inevitably produces and is immediately followed by antithesis. The eighteenth century age of good sense was followed by emotional movements. Rationalism and 'enlightenment' led to pietism, deistic philosophy to Methodism, the doctrines of the French equalitarian '*philosophes*' to the explosion of 1793, and ultimately to a romantic reaction in which Church and monarchy were resurrected. Nineteenth century Liberalism and optimism met their death-blow in the greatest of European wars, and whereas the Russian obscurantist autocracy of the 'Little Father' has given way to an entirely new experiment of a rationalistic oligarchy, the Liberalism of Central and Western Europe, instead of passing into something more radical and extreme, has actually reverted in varying degrees to an autocratic Conservatism. We are told that what Germany desires to-day is 'not clever men but men of vital action.' At the end of the war there seemed to be a really forward-looking and progressive spirit abroad in religious circles. After twelve years that spirit has somewhat diminished. It has created its own opposite, and the synthesis of the two is not yet achieved.

There are, however, two other reasons for the reaction, one of them good, the other not so good.

The good reason is a diminution in cocksureness. If the eighteenth century really believed in the capacity of human faculties to master the world, our own generation is at any rate less self-confident. In spite of the wonderful achievements of scientific enterprise during the past hundred years, it is steadily growing more and more evident that human reason is limited in its range, and that the human mind even at its best has much training yet to receive. H. G. Wells has written (and the R.P.A. has published the words):

> 'The mind of man may be primarily only a food-seeking, danger-avoiding, mate-finding instrument, just as the mind of a dog is, just as the nose of a dog is, or the snout of a pig. . . . The forceps of our minds are clumsy forceps and crush the truth a little in taking hold of it.'

Moreover *straight* thinking is rare, rationalization common, even among theologians. How difficult it is when anyone is writing about so sacred a thing as the Birth of our Lord to be sure that he is really judging the evidence with reverent impartiality, and

not merely rationalizing, swayed by an emotion, giving reasons for believing in something which he has made up his mind to accept on other grounds, such as the dictates of the heart, the wish to appear orthodox and to stand well with the authorities of the Church, or the desire to please those near and dear to him. Straight thinking could lead him to orthodox belief, but it would also lead him to recognize the limitations of our knowledge, and to admit that other straight thinkers had come to more reserved judgments, or to fresh interpretations of a sacred and spiritual fact. Logic, so far from being the servant of impartial and disinterested thinking, is often the slave of rationalization, and does not therefore yield true results. Moreover, as Bishop Westcott used to say, truth cannot be less than a perfect cube, and may well have at least six aspects, — and this is a maxim which is too often ignored whether by those calling themselves Modernists or Traditionalists.

It is also affirmed by some that reason alone can only give an imperfect answer to larger questions. It is but a beggarly two-foot rule by which puny man seeks to measure the majesty of eternal reality. Each reasoner judges the facts from within his own limited frame of reference; and no one can lay claim to be a universal observer. By all means let us be logical: but let us not rely too implicitly upon the security of logical processes. Our premisses may be faulty, and our data incomplete.

This mistrust of reason, as commonly employed, not unnaturally leads many persons to rely on other forms of perception, to wit intuition, guidance, '*Ahndung*,' or an illative sense, or, it may be, to an alleged revelation. There is indeed an actual disparagement of intelligence going on in some quarters, and a glorification of non-rational methods of obtaining knowledge.

The less satisfactory reason for this disparaging reaction is a failure of nerve. Many have looked at the findings of intelligent research and have been frightened by them. See, they say, what the age of reason has brought to Russia, and what a hundred years ago it brought to France. See how destructive is the application of criticism to the Bible and the Creeds. See what a gloomy picture the astronomer draws of the future, as the result of his researches. See what destruction from the air and the depths of the ocean has been wrought by the inventions

of applied science. Man is becoming too intelligent. It is time to call a halt, to stop the march of human mind before we and all our cherished institutions are wrecked. Let us go back to authority, and allow the truth to be doled out to us in small doses as we are able to bear it. A recent writer in a continental monthly has recorded that in France the erstwhile free thinkers are 'weary of their freedom, which has only led to nothingness. . . . To-day, one desires authority, and finds it in the Church, which is the only hope of France.' Renan, Loisy, Clemenceau are *démodé*. '*L'élite de la jeunesse française se rattache fervement aux traditions religieuses et philosophiques de la vieille France.*'

We are told by another (a Fascist) writer that the Greek spirit has prevailed over the Roman until it has become a positive danger to society and to morality.

> 'It flowered like an over-blown rose under the influence of a too hot sun after rain. It ran to excess. God was dethroned, and man placed in his stead as the lord of the universe. God became the creation of man instead of the Creator. . . . What we need is to return to the staider and more essential Roman spirit.'

Now, granted that an irresponsible devotion to the Greek spirit of lively speculation makes for the disintegration of society, there is surely no reason for panicking just because of the excesses of a few, or for putting a premium upon stupidity because some clever people have loudly trumpeted their atheism. Reason is a gift from God to His people; and although progress has been slow, a glance at the history of the human species reveals that man has travelled a long way from his brutish origins by the aid of this divine gift of sapientia. Against the air-bomb we have to set the radio; against poison-gas, the development of anaesthetics. Development is not one-sided. It is not all evil. It will be perfectly fatal for the Christian Church in this country or in any country to give up loving her God with her mind, as is ever her duty; and it is certainly the business of the Church to encourage all her members, and those of whom she has the care, to be intelligent and to train their minds to be active and alert. To accept Divine guidance exempts no one of us from hard thinking. God does not spoon-feed us with ready-made answers to all our problems. Intuition may point the way to probable solutions, but intuition needs 'checking' by the find-

ings of reason. Even the revelation of an active and responsive Deity has to be received, and reception means discovery, and involves intelligence.

Granted again that we may have to rely in many matters upon the authority of the expert, since highly-specialized knowledge outside our own department is not always possible, it will not do to allow our general education to become too scanty, or our wits to grow too dull, else we shall not be able to judge of the merits of our expert, when we choose him in order to place ourselves under his authority; and we may end by finding that we have put ourselves in subjection, not to a true expert, but to a quack or a sophist.

Granted, finally, that we all need to surrender our wills much more completely to the august Will of God than we do, such surrender is of the will and not of the intelligence. God deals with us as *persons*, not as automata. Originality may not necessarily consist always in thinking differently from other people. but it does consist in thinking for ourselves, and in appropriating the truth about the words by our own effort, starting *ab origine*. In some matters, chiefly the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith and way of living (but also in minor matters such as the multiplication table) the peak of discovery or of revelation is already past; but in other matters it has not yet been reached, and there is room for a great diversity of judgment and of research. Wherever this is so, it behoves us Christians to be in the forefront as pioneers, and not to be laggards and slothful. It must not be possible for persons like Mr. Mencken to cast a slur upon us, and to charge us with negligence in the performance of an ethical duty which certainly harmonizes with our Lord's familiar re-shaping of the Shema.

> 'Common-sense, kindliness, manliness, and good intentions will no more solve the problems of religion than they will the problems of strategy or of economics; religion imperatively needs all the brains that we can bring to it, and the fact that such vast numbers of our people actually prefer in their clergy a genial incompetence which makes no demands upon them, to an intellectual keenness which asks them to think, is precisely the fact which shows the evil of our present ways.'

Those words occurred in an Archiepiscopal report written in 1918; but are they not perhaps more to the point now than they were then?

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ATONEMENT*

The Dale Lectures of Dr. R. S. Franks on the Atonement are naturally *in piam memoriam,* and in the genuine piety of scientific theology they honour a great theologian by pursuing the same enquiry as he did without fearing to arrive at different conclusions. Dr. Franks is at one with Dr. Dale in agreeing that it involves a misapprehension of the principles and method that must actuate scientific theology if particular descriptions of the death of Christ, however valuable they may be, are made the basis of a theory of the Atonement. 'To construct a theory,' says Dale, 'we must put these descriptions aside and consider the Death of Christ in its real relations to God and to man,' *i.e.* a central standpoint must be found from which to survey these relations. It is in this crucial matter that the two theologians take different ground. Dr. Dale found his standpoint in the Eternal Law of Righteousness; Dr. Franks finds his in the doctrine concentrated in the words 'We love Him because He first loved us.' Herein is to be found the essential basis of the Abelardian theory of the Atonement, a theory which in the view of Dr. Franks not only goes to the heart of the matter but also is all-sufficient. This theory is not rightly named a moral theory, for it is even more a religious theory, nor will Dr. Franks allow that it is subjective, he styles it *experiential,* involving as it does an experienced relationship. 'God, Christ, His Cross, and the Divine love are all the objects of human trust and responsive love.' (We can picture Dr. Rashdall scrutinising very closely this aspect of the subject, not we think without ultimate re-assurance.)

But the real merit of this book lies not so much in its exposition of the theory of Abelard as in its utilisation of that theory to illuminate 'circumferential problems' and in its demonstration that it is able to deal with them successfully. Thus the theory is given that rational cogency which it needs if it is to commend itself and for lack of which, at the hands of both Abelard himself and of many of his expositors, it has failed to do. Finding Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* an unsurpassed 'example of method in Christian thinking,' Franks makes full though not uncritical use of it in his project of restatement. The voice in this book is the voice of Abelard but the hands are the hands of Anselm and the importance of Anselm lies not in the doctrine of 'satisfaction' that he developed but in the fact that he proffered a metaphysical basis for his theology and then made it the key to all the doctrinal ramifications implicit in the question, *Cur Deus Homo?* Thus for Dr. Franks as for Anselm the doctrine of the Atonement involves nothing less than the whole scheme of Christian theology and for Dr. Franks it is the principle of the Love of God revealed in Christ which 'must show itself able to act as a substantial basis' for the whole inter-related scheme. Further, if the principle is basically adequate then it can be made only less and not more adequate by adding to it doctrines inconsistent with it, even though these may be derived from the New Testament. Dr. Franks contrasts the systematic theology of the Scholastics with the non-systematic character of Apostolic Christianity, and particularly of Pauline Christianity, and of this

* *The Atonement.* The Dale Lectures for 1933. By Robert S. Franks, D.Litt. (Oxford University Press. 1934. Price 6/-.)

he says it will be no small thing

> 'to conserve for the Church the wealth of St. Paul's epistles, without in any way employing it to undo the work of his Master by emphasizing the wrong things in them, so as either to legalize or ethnicize Christianity.'

This book then is something more than its title is likely to suggest. Its root concern is with the philosophy of the Atonement, and it is marked all through by the searching thought of a philosophical mind. This is specially noticeable in Lecture V, which is the heart of the book and an outstanding example of *multum in parvo*. Here Dr. Franks outlines his metaphysic of Christianity and provides prolegomena which, in his opinion, are essential to an adequate theory of the Atonement. We cannot experience reconciliation with God unless we have some understanding of His nature and ways, and to accept the experience as a dark mystery is to ignore metaphysical implicates which are and must remain fundamental. The required basis for Christian theology is furnished by the identification of the Good Will, 'that than which nothing is greater and nothing is better,' with the Love of God. But this identification is possible only on the basic principle of personal revelation, *per Christum*, and Christ creates the insight to make it 'by putting us at a point where we can have this insight for ourselves.' Dr. Franks develops this theme in Lecture VI, where he uses his metaphysic to support religious experience against psychological misconstruction. But not all religion can be thereby justified. 'The true metaphysic of religion is a metaphysic of Christianity' for the reason that only a religion which is completely unified with ethics can be metaphysically justified, and Christianity unites religion and ethics in the apprehension of God's love as the foundation of the Universe, love being at once the highest ethical ideal of humanity and the nature of God Himself.

Lecture VII on The Forgiveness of Sins is, as Dr. Franks says, the keystone in his doctrinal arch, but we must forbear enlarging upon it save only to say that it is a model at once of lucidity, conciseness and appeal.

Taking his stand 'at the point where distortion ceases,' Dr. Franks is in a position to deal with theories of the Atonement which are theologically and ethically inadequate and he does so faithfully, *e.g.* Dr. Hicks' theory, set out in *The Fullness of Sacrifice*, is criticised most seriously because it uses a biological instead of a moral conception as its primary category. 'Life is what all religions offer, the peculiarity of Christianity is that it interprets life through love.' We must cease from attempting to interpret the Atonement through Old Testament or ethnic ideas of sacrifice, we must interpret our ideas of sacrifice through the Atonement; Christian theology has rightly connected the Atonement with the sufferings and death of Jesus, but Atonement is effected not by these things in themselves but by the love that they reveal. 'Their value is not purificatory, or expiatory, or satisfactory: it is revelatory.'

Dr. Franks faces the fact that the Abelardian theory of the Atonement implies a reconstructed Christology. We must at all costs uphold a real and complete human personality in Jesus for if, as this book most clearly demonstrates, grace must not be so construed as to imply a supersession of ethical personality, then neither must the Incarnation. To develop a Christology in line with his doctrine of Atonement, Dr. Franks envisages the need of another course of lectures. These present lectures make it abundantly clear that there is no one better qualified than himself to undertake it.

A. G. Coombs.

THE NEW KNOWLEDGE AND THE OLD TESTAMENT*

The New Knowledge about the Old Testament, by Sir Charles Marston, is the work of an amateur. It is none the worse for that, because it is the work of an honest amateur, who doesn't pretend to be an archaeologist or a scholar. The new knowledge is mainly derived from the Palestine explorations of two great archaeologists and scholars, Professor Garstang and Sir Flinders Petrie. Sir Charles Marston deals with Professor Garstang's exploration of the sites of Hazor, Ai, and Jericho, and Sir Flinders Petrie's exploration of Serabit, in the Sinai peninsula and Gaza in the Philistine plain.

Sir Charles Marston is not a fundamentalist, but he believes that the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, have a higher historical value than many higher critics are disposed to allow. He is convinced that those higher critics, whose conclusions are based upon internal evidence, derived from the study of the documents themselves, have much to learn from the archaeologists, who uncover, for the modern world, the remains of those civilizations whose history is recorded, or at least referred to, in the Biblical documents.

We are sure that all the greater Old Testament higher critics, as for instance, Driver, Burney, Buchanan Gray, Cheney, Wellhausen and many others, made the fullest use of archaeological results. Modern Biblical study owes an enormous debt to the archaeologists since the days of Layard, but it also owes an enormous debt to linguistic and literary criticism. These together are the twin foundations of sound progress in a true knowledge of the Old Testament. We would add further, that every great Biblical student or higher critic, must always hold that his conclusions are open to re-consideration in the light of further knowledge, particularly such knowledge as the archaeologist wins by his achievements.

Sir Charles Marston has become enamoured, and rightly enamoured, of the romance of archaeology, particularly archaeology in what are known as 'the Bible lands,' but if he were a Semitic scholar (and plainly he is not, or he could never think of Abimelech as a Philistine) he might be no less attracted by the extraordinary combination of philological learning, patient industry, and creative imagination, which have marked the achievements of the higher critics.

What we like about Sir Charles Marston's book, is the freshness and enthusiasm which characterize it. He writes whilst fresh impressions are still strong upon him, and this makes him both readable by, and comprehensible to, those who know nothing of Biblical archaeology or Biblical criticism, but would like to know something about them, if this can be told them clearly and simply. This is what Sir Charles Marston does. He shows how far Professor Garstang's research gives support to the Biblical account of Joshua's conquest of Canaan, and the statement that the only three fortified places which Joshua captured and destroyed were Jericho, Ai, and Hazor.

His summary of the results of Professor Garstang's researches at Jericho are of thrilling interest, and indicate the truth of the Biblical statement that the walls of Jericho fell down flat, though as the result of an earthquake, and that Joshua burnt, with all its contents, the captured city.

Professor Garstang's researches must, we think, lead to a revision of

* *The New Knowledge about the Old Testament.* By Sir Charles Marston. (Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1933. Price 5/-.)

the date of the Exodus and the Conquest of Canaan as generally determined by most higher critics. Jericho, according to the evidence both of pottery and scarabs, was captured and destroyed in the reign of Amenhetep III, who reigned from 1413-1377 B.C. In that case the Pharoah of the Oppression and the Exodus was Thotmes III, who reigned from 1501 to 1447 B.C.

It seems probable that the Egyptian princess who befriended Moses was the notable Hatshepsut, a woman of remarkable character and ability.

Our author's interpretation of the bearing of Sir Flinders Petrie's excavations at Gaza upon the civilization of the Hyksos are of immense interest. The Hyksos, it seems quite clear, were not Semitic but Elamite in race.

Sir Charles Marston makes many interesting points. We can only here refer to one more. Since childhood, we have been interested in the hornets which Yahweh sent to drive out the Canaanites before the Israelites. It would seem that the hornets were not insects (any more than the ravens which fed Elijah were birds) but the Egyptian invaders of Canaan, that is Thotmes III and his successors, whose badge was the hornet. They seem to have broken the power of the Canaanite city-states before Joshua's advent.

Our author rightly stresses the great value of the pottery record in dating archaeological discovery, but seems to regard it as more modern than it really is. We remember being told by Dr. McCallister, when he was excavating Gezer in 1910, that he was able to date all the successive strata by the pottery remains found in them, and he regarded this as the most reliable method of dating. No doubt additional data for this kind of chronology has been obtained since then, and not least by Professor Garstang, but we believe that no little credit in this matter is due to the excavators of Gezer.

This book reminds us, in some respects, of a little-known, but extremely interesting, work, *From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan,* by the late Sir William Willcocks, the designer and projector of the Aswan Dam, and who, as an engineer, knew the *terrain* from the Nile to the Euphrates, as few have known it.

H.D.A.M.

A GUIDE TO INDIAN RELIGIONS*

Dr. Macnicol's book is timely, and is admirable in its sympathetic and learned exposition of the great Indian religions.

Delivered as Wilde Lectures in ' Natural and Comparative Religion ' at Oxford and in similar courses in Scottish Universities—these very readable and vivid chapters do not aim either at criticism or at comparison, but at providing ' a guide toward a sympathetic understanding.' In this they are eminently successful, and ought to send the reader with deepened insight to make those personal contacts with men of other faiths, which have made the author one of the most respected and beloved of missionaries.

Only so can the student discover the values of these other faiths. While the author recognises that bad elements as well as good may be very much alive, his aim is to find

> ' what it is in these religions that at the present time appears to bring comfort and to give satisfying answers to those who bring to them their problems and their needs ' ;

* *The Living Religions of the Indian People.* By Nicol Macnicol. (Student Christian Press. 1934. 15/-.)

and with Dr. Macnicol as guide, it is pleasant and profitable to tread 'the six roads of the spirit, still trodden with desire and hope and longing' by a fifth of the world's people.

To the complex and baffling system of Hinduism, he devotes just over a hundred pages, and, as in his admirable paper for the Jerusalem Conference, he contrasts the vivid description of Sir Alfred Lyall—'a troubled sea . . . of boundless credulity and grotesque invention,' with that of Sir S. Radhakrishnan 'a subtly unified mass of spiritual thought and realisation . . . characterized by its adherence to fact.' Both descriptions are of course true: 'the hospitality of the Hindu mind,' the long history of its growth, the varieties of its stages of culture, its pantheism—these make Hinduism all-inclusive, as Islam is made exclusive by its monotheism, by its far more uniform culture, by the intolerance of the Semitic mind.

To Indian Islam Dr. Macnicol devotes only a third of the space given to Hinduism, for it is an exotic faith which has been naturalized in India, and the 'subtle invasive power' of Hinduism is illustrated by the careers of Akbar and Kabir, who appealed to both Hindus and Mohamedans, and by that of Nanak, founder of Sikhism—to which a separate and very interesting chapter is devoted.

In tracing the inter-action of these two strangely different religions Dr. Macnicol is at his best; he is himself poet and mystic, and realizes the deep truth of Professor Nicholson's words—'reason is dualistic, love unifies by transcending thought.' Thus while the story of Islam in India is the story of 'an austere and rigid faith exposed constantly to the subtle infection of the Hinduism which surrounds it on every side,' it is no less true that 'the mystic Islam of the Sufis' has been widespread in Northern Hinduism.

What then are the complementary truths of these two rival claimants to the allegiance of India's heart and head?

Islam offers her a creed—'simple, concrete . . . austere . . . submission to the Will of Allah.' This 'may create strength for action quite as often as passivity in endurance.' It is too apt to produce fatalism: and modern Hindus are striving against the same psychological tendency.

> 'The sense of the futility of effort and the vanity of all human purposes hangs like a pall over most of the life of India—the creation alike of the Hindu and the Muslim religious tradition.'

How are these religions to adapt and adjust themselves to modern conditions? Dr. Macnicol deals sympathetically with modern reform movements, and with the tremendous struggle between truth and unbelief in the soul of educated India.

He notes the still living influence of Bhakti (devotion) and of Ahimsā—especially in its re-definition by Mr. Gandhi—which makes it forbid even an uncharitable thought. In his Jerusalem paper, our author chooses this 'as suggesting the characteristic tone, the prevailing *Ethos* of the Hindu culture.' But 'headlong unguided Bhakti makes for horrible degeneracy'—and Ahimsā is too much centred, even in a Gandhi, upon cow-protection: 'this,' says the Mahatma, 'is the central fact of Hinduism.' To what length this sentiment has gone is illustrated in the story of Jainism, of whose theology and ethics it is alike the base. Into this ancient and complex world comes Christianity, and the spirit of the author is that of the true Christian 'who will not quench the smoking flax.' There are many spiritual links between such a Christian and the spiritually-minded Hindu: Indian Christian Scholars are exploring more and more the affinities,

exhibiting 'Christianity as Bhakti-harga' and 'Jesus as the Avatar.' But Christianity cannot be content to accept the Hindu compromise of 'Jesus as *an* Avatar,' and while recognizing that 'Hindu India has produced more Christlike characters than the Christians around them,' the author maintains that it is not Hinduism but Christianity that is able to uplift the untouchables, and that not only as a leaven but as the parent of notable types of spiritual life is the Church of Christ in India a witness to His vivifying power.

> 'The standard by which life's values are measured is openly accepted by the most thoughtful as that of Christ — God still holds India by the roots of her being, and therefore Christ speaks to her, and His Church has a witness to bear to her.'

The Church will do well to listen to Dr. Macnicol, and to see that its ministers are informed by his spirit.

KENNETH SAUNDERS.

A BARTHIAN THERMOMETER FOR THE CHURCHES*

This is a difficult book, but well worth study, although a continuous and complete reading could hardly be profitable. It is not only that it is Barthian in style. One grows accustomed to gathering some general impression of what, one hopes, that school intends to convey by its theological *pointillisme*. The trouble is that while we are afforded vivid flashes that show us, as clearly as may be, Barth standing in his darkness, and while we are enabled to hear with amazing exactness the tones of the thunder of his opponents, never can we be sure of Dr. Adolf Keller himself.

The book opens with a review of Barthianism which concludes:

> 'In this battle (between the new theology and the church) we behold a gigantic spiritual struggle between prophetism and institutionalism, between Spirit and organization, between a pneumatological and a sociological conception of the church's mission, between a church which does not want to be of the world, and a church which feels itself divinely called and, just because of the Revelation and the Incarnation, feels itself obliged to speak, to serve and to fight in this very world.'

The author's purpose is to examine the churches by their reactions to Barthianism. Have they ever heard of it, or how seriously are they considering it? Do they violently reject it, or welcome its searchings of their own states, admit its accusations and seek its help? The religious health of a church, or of a party in a church, may be determined by this thermometer.

> 'Barthianism is, therefore, a picture of our religious situation inasmuch as it portrays the dissatisfaction of the church with itself, the self-contradiction which results as soon as it orientates itself by its God-given commission and not by its cultural requirements. This . . . constitutes a crisis such as every prophetic message brings with it for all theology and church life.'

In his investigation Dr. Keller discovers and clearly re-states most of the arguments against Barthianism. He is shrewd here. He notes, for instance, that those whom Barth accuses in the name of 'existential thinking,' are justified in replying that so to think means only, in plain language, to think as Barth does. But this noted, Dr. Keller does no more about it.

* *Karl Barth and Christian Unity*. By Adolf Keller, D.D., LL.D. (Lutterworth Press. 1934. 10/6.)

The forces are set for the struggle but never get to grips in his mind. It may be the struggle is eternal, but that is no reason for not taking a side. Were we all theological pacifists, of such endless sympathy and understanding that our own view mattered nothing, the other person's, all, then the Barthian Crisis would be no more, and Dr. Keller's own theology collapse.

In England, we gather from this book, little headway is made by a theology which, while it teaches that God is Unknowable, can yet, strangely enough, assert Him to be Irrational; which holds God to be Totally Other and man so utterly removed in his nature and circumstance that the keenest human experience can only be of a God of Wrath. Such a teaching, Dr. Keller observes, runs counter to 'the typically Anglican view of the Incarnation.' At first sight this is a little disingenuous. Surely the view that man's nature is of a kind to be taken up into God, and was so taken up in Christ, is rather specifically Christian than typically Anglican? But Dr. Keller is consistent in his apparent indifference to the soundly Christian character of most of the criticisms made of Barth. Thus he recognizes that French theologians discover in the Theology of Crisis a neglect of ethics; the substitution of a mystical 'Christ-God' for the 'Saviour of the Gospels'; 'the tearing asunder of time and eternity' and the making void of history.

> Altogether French is, of course, the rejection of Irrationalism, since it is unthinkable to French Rationalism that God could not be thought.'

And Keller quotes Lemâitre:

> 'Whoever denies the immanence of God in man and in history, can only appropriate the religion of the God of Love at the price of illusory imaginings.'

He is satisfied only to comment that 'the gentle Pelagianism of such a theology, which has as yet not passed through the crisis, here revolts against the rigorous spirit of Calvin.' Exactly; and calling people names does not answer them.

In America Dr. Keller finds Barthianism, in the few quarters that know of it, opposed by idealism and the social gospel, what he calls 'American Activism,' which he acknowledges to have been world-wide in its effectiveness for good. It is plain his own sympathies are Barthian, but he makes no attempt to explain or defend them as against the American case.

In the same manner there is a long discussion of the interesting relationship between Barthianism and Roman-Catholicism. They have much in common: the rejection of individualism and of the claims of history and science to independence; but in the end there can be no compromise between a theology which casts all its light into the gulf separating God from man, avowing that theology's only and admittedly futile purpose is to show the darkness of the gulf to be impenetrable, and a theology for which the doctrines of the *analogia entis* and the *Imago Dei* are of paramount importance; nor any compromise between the Barthian view of grace as cataclysmic and even so, when all is said, unreceivable, and the view *gratia non tellit naturam sed reparat et perficit.*; no compromise, in a word, between a theology whose message is that there is no message, and a church whose claim is that she has the message, and she alone.

In none of these instances does Dr. Keller attempt to determine between Barth and his critics by reference to logic, or reasonableness, to the New Testament or to Christian history and experience. He does not confute, admit, nor amend. He is content to note the criticisms made of Barth more forcibly than we remember to have seen it done before; then he draws

a line, as it were, and re-affirms as boldly as ever the Barthian negatives which presumably are his own.

It is always hard to see where a Barthian stands in relation to philosophy, history and science, and in particular to Biblical criticism. This book offers little direct evidence but some of its asides are illuminating. The author quotes Brunner with approval:

> 'This Unattainable, the Totally Other, the truly Transcendent cannot be attained by a scientific nor by a religious method. . . . Brunner warns theology point-blank not to return to the scientific "house of slavery."'

Dr. Keller sees Barthianism and Roman Catholicism occupying 'a common front in the present struggle against the bolshevizing and secularizing of the world.' In speaking of American Fundamentalism he writes:

> 'These circles must be receptive to the Barthian insistence upon the old-orthodox positions. A fundamentalist like Machen, who has written a scientific book on the Virgin Birth, will be glad to discover the importance which this dogma receives in Barth's *Dogmatik*.'

Incidentally, it appears that science is admissible where its findings are in agreement with Barth. Elsewhere Barthianism is said to acknowledge the traditional dogmas of the church as revealed and final truth. These hints make it plain that if Barthianism never definitely rejects philosophy, history and science, this is not from any lingering love of them, but rather because it dare not, at any rate not openly yet, in the modern world.

Dr. Keller's own position is apparently to be described these days as Oecumenical. The Preface names him the 'Man of World Protestantism.' He is a General Secretary of the Stockholm Conference Continuation Committee and in charge of the International Social Institute. For him the Oecumenical Movement is necessary, not only to heal the broken Church but also, and very rightly, because the primary questions of to-day are international—social economy, peace and the family. According to him the Movement recognizes that the 'Hidden God' is also in man, and that truth may reside in other theologies and religions. Naturally Barthians criticize the Oecumenical Movement at these two points as 'cultural' and 'worldly.' We hoped in this chapter at last for some resolution of the opposing themes so loudly heard in the book. But again Dr. Keller has nothing to say. He describes the Oecumenical Movement as he sees it, states the Barthian objections, and there leaves the matter, 'Oecumenical' even concerning the opposition to the Oecumenical, where, if anywhere, he is personally engaged. All he will venture is:

> . . . Barthianism with its questions ought to do the Ecumenical Movement the service of rendering the "essential" distress perceptible in the "non-good" distress. It ought, however, within the church and within the human limits of the Ecumenical Movement, to believe in the operation of a hidden God, Who in this very paradoxical fashion desires to work in this "very human cause."

A difficult book, which as a whole gives little satisfaction, but, page by page, is well worth the great effort of the disconnected spasms of attention required to read it. Perhaps its explanation is Dr. Keller's Oecumenical mind. It will be a major tragedy if this new and longed-for movement towards Christian unity produces, as it seems to promise, syncretistic minds capable of believing all things at once, or, as in this book, capable of clearly stating fundamental distinctions and either blandly ignoring the differences

or, recognizing them, just sheerly refusing to take either side, be the Faith itself at stake. There will be a glad reaction towards sectarianism when we and our opponents both grow suddenly tired of lectures, however well-intentioned and shrewd, delivered *ex cathedra* from the security of the Oecumenical fence.

M.T.D.

A FREE MIND AND AN ENTHRALLED HEART*

The author of this little book, Dr. Angus, Professor of New Testament and Historical Theology in St. Andrew's College at the University of Sydney, needs little introduction. He is well known as a learned authority on the history of the Early Church, particularly in its contacts with Graeco-Roman paganism, and he has recently figured as a very able and courageous victim of a charge of heresy brought against him by his fellow Presbyterians in the Commonwealth of Australia. The case, which lasted long, was recorded in the *Modern Churchman*. It was as unedifying in its futility as our own Liverpool Cathedral Case, but happier in its issues for the cause of freedom and truth. In September last the final adjudication was made by the Judicial Commission for the Presbyterian Church of Australia in favour of Dr. Angus.

This time Dr. Angus has given us a book of devotion, and it might well serve as an answer to his critics, though it contains no polemics, and one feels that heresy hunts were very far from his mind while writing it. It is a book of affirmations and breathes a spirit of limpid sincerity.

Englishmen are usually shy of devotional books, and for very good reasons. Perhaps a glance at the chapter headings of this book might suggest the conventional book of piety: *The Ever Living, Joy of Loving Hearts, Jesus' Optimism,* and the less happy title *Jesus' Cause in Crescendo*. But there is no maudlin sentiment here. That is the rare merit of Dr. Angus book among books of devotion. Moreover, it contains no platitudes.

Pietism has its rightful place in the Christian tradition and it is not to be confused with its spurious, misguided, and often bizarre manifestations which attract the shallow and repel the more virile spirits. Dr. Angus with his erudite knowledge of the Mystery Religions, is particularly well equipped as a guide in a devotional approach to Jesus which is psychologically sound, yet not lacking in the warmth which is characteristic of the apostolic succession of the saints back to the time of St. Paul.

A historian himself, the author quotes with approval from Professor Deissmann:

> '"One must render to history the things that are history's, and to love the things that are love's . . ." The way of historical science is narrow. If one wants truly to grasp Jesus one must make the way broader. It is the way which Paul called "The more excellent way."'

He insists on this personal knowledge and appreciation of Jesus as a fundamental of true Christianity, and the only valuable approach to the Incarnation. Formulae are poor things and outside the heart of the matter,

> 'The deepest experiences of religion are always individual experiences, communicable in part but largely incommunicable.'

The book abounds in wise aphorisms. Here are a few:—

> 'No man can have any true religion except his own.'
>
> 'Self-sacrifice is the only kind of sacrifice recognised by Jesus.'

* *Jesus in the Lives of Men.* By S. Angus, D.Litt. Second Edition. (Angus and Robertson, Ltd. 1934. Price 3/6.)

'The fundamental matter among those who profess to accept Jesus as the Prince of Life is not with what accent we proclaim "Lord, Lord," but with what spirit of loyalty we do the things which he commands us.'

'Jesus is to-day all, and more than all, that His followers of every school and creed, and of no creed, love in Him.'

There is nothing new in the book, but it must be remembered that it was only at a great price that Modernism has bought the spiritual freedom that pervades this little book. We trust it will be widely read.

The Australian Book Company, 37 Great Russell Street, W.C.1, who are Agents for Messrs. Angus and Robertson, point out that the first edition was sold out immediately and no copies were available for overseas until a second edition was printed.

J. McDONALD.

A SHORT CHURCH HISTORY*

The publication of Volume II of *The Christian Religion, its Origin and Expansion* completes the series of three volumes under the general editorship of Dr. Bethune-Baker. The first volume was concerned with The Rise of the Christian Church and the third with The Church To-day, its Faith, its Worship, and its Task in the World. The second volume, now under review, is entitled *The Expansion of the Christian Church* and has three parts, The Church in the Roman Empire, by Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, and The Church in the Middle Ages and The Church in England, both by Rev. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. The parts can be obtained separately for 2/6 each.

Mr. Gardner-Smith takes the history of the Church to 476 A.D., and gives an attractive and readable account of the dramatic story of the conflict of Church and Empire, of the growth of Church organisation and creed, and of the appearance of monasticism. This should prove a useful book for schools, to provide for which is one of the purposes of the series. Dr. Foakes-Jackson has a no less difficult task in compressing the Church's story from 476-1417 A.D. into 150 pages: his great learning and judgment ensure a balanced and careful account, though for school use it is somewhat overweighted with the political history of the Church and too little relieved by anecdote or brief account of the everyday religious life, secular or monastic.

It may be doubted whether in so short a book it was worth while giving space to the excellent summaries which are at the head of each chapter: on the other hand a table of important events, such as is placed at the end of Part I, would have been equally valuable at the ends of the other parts.

Part III, The Church in England, opens with a brief *résumé* of the history up to the time of the Reformation, and the subsequent 100 pages carry the story to our own times. Every reader will differ in emphasis and proportion from any author of a brief history of great events: the history as here given is, we venture to believe—though not all in the Church of England will share the opinion—both broadly fair and often illuminating, and, if it leaves other readers besides the reviewer with a desire to know more both of the facts and the writer's interpretation of them, it will have proved its value. The concluding chapters recognise that the intellectual changes of the past eighty years are an important factor in the history of the Church, and the

* *The Expansion of the Christian Church*. By P. Gardner-Smith and F. J. Foakes-Jackson. (Cambridge University Press. 1934. 7/6.)

last chapter outlines the growth of the movement towards the reunion of the Churches. This volume as a whole should certainly be useful in schools, both to teachers and older pupils, and if it could be widely read it would much assist in what, in Church Assembly circles, is called the education of the electorate.

H. G. MULLINER.

THE FACE OF TRUTH*

It has been said that the poet leaps across the abyss of truth while the philosopher is building the foundations of a bridge. In *The Unknown God* Mr. Alfred Noyes attempts to shed the poet's wings and don the mantle of the philosopher; an effort which for him personally was wholly unnecessary, since he admits at the outset that

> 'after wading through endless pages of discursive reasoning in later life, it seems to me that all the essentials were mine by intuition, or direct mental vision, as far back as I can remember.'

There speaks the poet and the mystic, or 'contemplative,' as Mr. Noyes prefers to call him, and his book, which we are led to understand is a spiritual autobiography, is really the sincere effort of the poet to understand exactly why the philosopher should struggle with the building of a bridge while he himself can leap across the abyss so easily. It would seem that here the spirit of the poet is troubled by the mind of the philosopher, a conflict which does indeed not infrequently arise, when he, despite his most vivid intuitions, has no choice but to

> 'renounce all easy hope, all consolation, all but the wintry smile upon the face of Truth.'

Mr. Noyes begins the record of his search for Truth with the irrefutable statement that

> 'the need of the world to-day is a religious need. Consciously or unconsciously, all our thought, our art, our literature, is impoverished by the lack of any positive and fundamental belief with which it can confront on equal terms the vast universe opened up by modern science, and feel, as other ages felt, the throb of a definite purpose in human life.'

Thence he describes his varied mental excursions among the great agnostics, notably Voltaire, Spencer, and Haeckel. He speaks also of Darwin, and that great pessimist, Thomas Hardy. Mr. Noyes proves that in every instance these so-called unbelievers postulate the necessity for belief in a 'First Cause,' an 'Unknowable,' a 'God-idea.' Even Voltaire must proclaim that: 'If the world does not prove the existence of a Supreme Architect, I consent to be called . . . a fool,' and Haeckel, no doubt surprisingly to those unacquainted at firsthand with his writings, declares that:

> 'Our cosmology knows only one sole God, and this almighty God rules the whole of Nature without exception.'

Mr. Noyes suggests that even so materialistic an agnostic as W. K. Clifford, who cannot believe anything of which he is not rationally convinced, is, by very nature of his search, on the way to God. This hungering and thirsting after Truth, this never-ending quest for Reality, is in itself an earnest of satisfaction, for never in the natural scheme of life can there be hunger without the possibility of food, nor any quest without the certainty of a goal.

* *The Unknown God.* By Alfred Noyes. (Sheed & Ward. 1934. 7/6.)

In Chapters 12 and 13 the language of the philosopher is abandoned, and page upon page of prose-poetry follows. The miracles of Nature—commonplaces to the man who sees a tree as 'only a green thing which gets in the way'—reveal everywhere the immanence of God. An apple-bough in blossom is a

> 'spiritual revelation, an exquisite earthly form, a shining hieroglyph, issuing from an absolute Mystery, and organised in an intelligible pattern to express and symbolise for finite minds the perfect Beauty of the eternal world.'

He speaks with no uncertain voice of the inevitable marriage of art and religion, of the indissoluble union of religion and Nature: for 'great poetry and great art show us the world *"sub specie aeternitatis."*' The 'Light whose smile kindles the Universe' illumines the soul of the genius, and whether he be pagan or Christian the truths he expresses are flashes of intuition from the world of eternal values.

> 'The function of great poetry is concerned not with the unreal or fantastic, but with the far profounder mystery of reality . . . The strongest part of our creative literature was its unconscious religion.'

The fact that so many diverse minds, the scientist, the philosopher, the artist (using the word in its widest sense) have arrived independently at the same conclusions seems to Mr. Noyes undeniable proof of the reality of the truths proclaimed by religion. And there is another supreme test. There are no passages in great literature, not even in the inspired utterances of Dante, Shakespeare or Milton, so charged with the sense of the Divine, of the ineffable, as are the simple words of the Gospels.

> 'Shakespeare's words are gnats dancing in the sun compared with the stupendous implications of that quiet re-assurance, addressed to a woman mourning for the dead, and not only to her, but to all those who have ever looked down speechlessly into a grave—"I am the Resurrection and the Life."'

Mr. Noyes considers the sayings of Jesus from the standpoint of pure literature, and finds in them the quintessential ring of final truth, the absolute sense of the holy and the sublime to which no human poet has attained. The words of Jesus are in the realm of literature an incarnation: simple words, familiar to every man, are here so charged with spirit that they transcend their original meaning.

The problem of evil and pain, the purpose of life, the abiding truth of Christianity inherent in its very core irrespective of doctrine and dogma; all these questions are dealt with, and often conclusively. Mr. Noyes has written a book which is often beautiful, and sometimes inspired, always interesting and informative. But one asks to what sort of an audience, if any, he is appealing? To the believer *The Unknown God* will be simply a confirmation, from the Roman Catholic standpoint to which Mr. Noyes is a convert, of his own firmly-rooted beliefs; the atheist may refuse to open the book by reason of its title alone; the man in the street will find himself out of his depths on the first page. There remains the sincerely interested and open-minded agnostic, and provided he be enough of a mute inglorious Milton to receive poetry, to him Mr. Noyes's book will come as a long-sought revelation.

DALLAS KENMARE.

FEAR OF THE DEAD*

The dead have always created a sense of awe as much as a feeling of loss. There is something mysterious and uncanny about a corpse. This attitude has been prevalent not only among early men and savages, but also among civilised peoples in ancient and modern times. Awe and mystery, however, should not be confused with fear and dread, and when we are told that savages *fear* the dead we wonder whether they do. Sir J. G. Frazer, using the term 'primitive' with the lack of discrimination characteristic of an old school of anthropology, seeks to show in his William Wyse Lectures that the general attitude of primitive peoples to the spirits of the dead is one of fear rather than of affection. He means by fear, terror, and not awe.

Sir J. G. Frazer's books are treasuries of valuable and interesting information, and his gifts as a writer give them a special appeal. The Wyse lectures are no exception. When this has been said, it must be confessed that a critical reader will find them very perplexing. The authorities quoted seem often to contradict themselves and one another. Thus, apart from the many admitted exceptions to the author's rule, the cases which are supposed to support it are often inconclusive. There seems, moreover, to be a good deal of confusion between fear and awe, ghosts and spirits. On the whole, we are not given really conclusive evidence of a general fear of the dead. All that we gather is that some of the dead are regarded with affection, while others are regarded with dread; that some of them become good spirits or angels, while others become bad spirits or devils. Bad spirits bring evil; they are the spirits of people who were bad in life and are equally bad in death. Good spirits also may bring evil. If they bring evil, which may be regarded as punishment for violation of the rules of correct behaviour, they are not feared and hated any more than good parents are feared and hated for correcting their children. The savage is more logical than most people are willing to admit.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

ROYDS'S EPISTLES AND GOSPELS.

SIR,

I am grateful to Mr. Boys-Smith for his careful and discriminating review of my little book, but with your permission I should like to challenge him on two points in the Epistle and Gospel for the second Sunday in Lent.

(1) He says 'consecration' is a word more in current use than 'sanctification'; 'why not use it here, and so be at once more exact and more intelligible?' I tried both words on the children in my village school. What is sanctification? Immediately a hand went up, and I got the answer, 'Made holy.' What is consecration? I could get no answer at all. Possibly the Cambridge children are ''igher learn'd nor we.' We consecrate churchyards and bishops, but not everybody; whereas 'sanctify' is in the Catechism. And ἁγιασμός occurs three times in this passage. Will 'consecration' fit all three?

* *The Fear of the Dead in Primitive Religion.* Lectures delivered on the William Wyse foundation at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1932–1933. By Sir James George Frazer. (Macmillan & Co. 1933. pp. viii, 204. 10/6 net.)

(2) 'True, Master, for even the dogs.' Mr. Boys-Smith says, 'The rendering should be, 'Yes it is, Sir, for even, etc.' The woman was not acquiescing in Jesus' word, but contradicting Him.' Was she? Surely Ναὶ, Κύριε expresses agreement, not contradiction. I should paraphrase 'I quite agree, Sir. I was not asking for the children's bread, but only for the crumbs, and I claim a dog's right to these.'

T. F. Royds.

Haughton Rectory,
Stafford.

'TO HIM THAT HATH, SHALL BE GIVEN.'

Sir,

It is strange to find on page 592 of the current number of the *Modern Churchman* the lines

'One crowded hour of glorious life
Is worth an age without a name'

attributed to Walter Scott.

They are by Thomas Osbert Mordaunt, and the poem of which they are part, may be found in the *Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse* (pp. 433-435).

Eric Rede Buckley.

Polstead Rectory,
Colchester.
January 18th, 1935.

ANNUAL GATHERING IN THE METROPOLIS.

Sir,

I shall be grateful if you will allow me to notify the members of the Union of the particulars of the Annual Meetings, *viz*:—

Wednesday, May 15th, 1935, 11.30 a.m. Holy Communion at St. Andrew's, Ashley Place, S.W.1. Preacher: The Rev. Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, C.H., D.D.

2.30 p.m. Annual General Meeting, Church House, Westminster.

7 p.m. Dinner at The Royal Adelaide Gallery Restaurant (Gatti's). Tickets, 6/- each. As this Dinner will be a complimentary dinner to our new President, it is hoped that there will be a large attendance of members.

T. J. Wood.

The Church House,
Westminster,
London, S.W.1.
March 4th, 1935.

CORRIGENDUM.

[We regret that in our last issue Professor Cadoux's address was incorrectly given as Manchester College. Professor Cadoux is on the staff of Mansfield College.—Ed., *M.C.*]